

bulletin

Vol. XMI No. 10

Editor
Corman
Secretary

WERNER COHN
USE OF AIR
ESTUARIES AND TERRI-
TORIES

Article by

802

703





The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XVI, No. 409 • PUBLICATION 2818

May 4, 1947

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Publications, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U. S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION:
52 issues, \$5; single copy, 15 cents

Published with the approval of the
Director of the Bureau of the Budget

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEESHIP FOR THE TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

by Robert R. Robbins

This article traces the steps in the development of the trusteeship agreement for the former Japanese Mandated Islands which was approved by the Security Council on April 2, 1947. Only congressional authorization to accept on behalf of the United States is now required to approve and bring into force the trusteeship agreement for the Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The Security Council of the United Nations has completed its deliberations on the United States draft trusteeship agreement for the former Japanese Mandated Islands. By a unanimous vote on April 2, 1947, it approved, with but four minor changes, the text of the agreement proposed by the United States and submitted to the Secretary-General by the United States Representative in the Security Council on February 17, 1947. The final acceptance of the agreement without substantial changes was reached only after full acceptance of the United States view that the matter of trusteeship for the former Japanese Mandated Islands does not depend upon, and need not await, the general peace settlement with Japan.

According to article 16 of the agreement, the approval by the Government of the United States after due constitutional process is also required as well as that of the Security Council, which has already been given, before the agreement comes into force. When that process is completed, the jurisdiction which the United States now exercises under military government in the mandated Marianas, Caroline, and Marshall Islands of the central Pacific will be transformed and established within the international trusteeship system of the United Nations.

A review of the problem of trusteeship and non-self-governing territories in Allied consultations during the war, the initiative by the United States on this issue, and the constructive leadership it exercised throughout the prolonged deliberations which culminated in the writing of chapters XI, XII, and XIII into the Charter of the United Nations at the San Francisco conference is set forth in an earlier issue of the BULLETIN.¹ A more recent BULLETIN article² deals with the inauguration of the trusteeship system provided for by the Charter and the organization of the Trusteeship Council following the approval by the General Assembly in December 1946 of trusteeship agreements for eight non-strategic territories, all of which were formerly mandates under the League of Nations. The most recent step in the development of the international trusteeship system is the action taken by the Security Council to place the former Japanese Mandated Islands under trusteeship. To

¹ Ralph J. Bunche, "Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories in the Charter of the United Nations", BULLETIN of Dec. 30, 1945, p. 1037.

² Elizabeth H. Armstrong and William I. Cargo, "The Inauguration of the Trusteeship System of the United Nations", BULLETIN of Mar. 23, 1947, p. 511.

this end, the United States submitted the draft trusteeship agreement which may now be considered in the light of its recent approval by the Security Council.

At the outset of any discussion concerning the disposition of the former Japanese Mandated Islands, it is useful to bear in mind the nature and extent of these islands and the historical facts which led up to the assumption of United States jurisdiction over them.

The Isles of Micronesia

The islands of Micronesia are sometimes considered as an archipelago of great extent which lies just north of the Equator in the central Pacific. The archipelago contains three groups of islands which stretch fully 2,600 miles from east to west, and about 500 miles in greatest width. The island groups are: the Marshall Islands, including Kwajelein, Eniwetok, and Majuro, which lie about 1,500 miles southwest of Hawaii; the Caroline Islands, including Kusaie, Ponape, Truk, Ulithi, Yap, and the Palaus, the latter extending to within several hundred miles of the Philippines; and the Marianas Islands, including Saipan and Tinian in addition to the United States possession of Guam, extending northward to within 1,000 miles of Japan proper.³ With respect to the area, population, and economy of the islands, the United States Representative in the Security Council stated on February 26, 1947, that "The Japanese Mandated Islands—the Marshalls, Marianas, and Carolines—consist of some 98 islands and island clusters with a total land mass of only 846 square miles, a total population of only about 48,000 native inhabitants, and negligible indigenous economic resources."⁴

Many of the isles of Micronesia were discovered by Spanish navigators during the sixteenth century. In 1565 Spain annexed the Marianas. It was only in the latter part of the nineteenth century, however, that the islands of the central Pacific acquired international political signifi-

³ Also included in the Pacific area of Micronesia are the Gilbert Islands, which lie across the Equator, and the mandated island of Nauru, which lies just south of the Equator.

⁴ BULLETIN of Mar. 9, 1947, p. 416.

⁵ *Foreign Relations, The Paris Peace Conference, 1919, vol. XIII, pp. 97-98, 103-104, 277-278.* (Department of State publication 2757.)

cance. Germany took possession of the Marshalls in 1885. The Spanish flag was raised over the Carolines the following year. In 1898, at the close of the Spanish-American War, the United States acquired Guam. In 1899 Germany purchased the remaining Marianas and all of the Carolines from Spain and remained in possession of these and the Marshalls until World War I. In October 1914 Japanese forces occupied all the German islands in Micronesia except Nauru, which was occupied by the Australians.

By article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles, Germany renounced in favor of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions. These colonies, described in paragraphs 5 and 6 of article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, were subsequently administered under "B" and "C" mandates. On May 7, 1919, the territories referred to were allocated to mandatories for administration under the terms of article 22 by a decision of representatives of the United States, France, Great Britain, and Italy. The decision included the following stipulation regarding the German islands north of the Equator: "The mandate shall be held by Japan." The United States, on November 9, 1920, declared to the other governments to which Germany renounced her colonies that "at the previous request of President Wilson" at the Paris Peace Conference and in the hope that it might be made available by agreement as an international cable station, "it is the understanding of the Government that the Island of Yap was not included in the action of the Supreme Council on May 7, 1919."

In as much as the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan did not share that understanding, correspondence ensued which involved the terms of the mandate under which Japan was to administer the former German islands north of the Equator. The Governments of the United States and Japan reached an agreement with regard to the temporary operation of the Naba-Yap-Guam cables, with the consent of Great Britain, France, and Italy. This agreement was evidenced by Executive Order No. 3600, December 24, 1921, and an exchange of notes of January 30 and February 4, 1922.⁵

Japan was assigned a class "C" mandate over the former German islands in the Pacific Ocean north

of the Equator. Specific obligations were imposed upon the mandatory power, notably to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the natives, to prohibit slavery and forced labor, to control traffic in arms, to exclude alcoholic beverages, to permit freedom of worship and missionary activities, to refrain from building fortifications and military bases, and to submit an annual report to the League of Nations. On these terms Japan was confirmed as the mandatory power by the Council of the League of Nations on December 17, 1920.

United States arrangements with Japan for communication facilities were further recorded in the treaty with Japan regarding rights in former German islands in the Pacific Ocean north of the Equator, and in particular the Island of Yap, signed at Washington February 11, 1922, and brought into force July 13, 1922.

The islands under mandate attracted little international attention until rumors gained currency in 1932 that Japan was fortifying some of the islands, notably Truk, in violation of the mandate. Japan categorically denied such reports and successfully avoided international investigation. In 1933 the fortification issue became subordinate to Japan's notice of intention to withdraw from the League and resulting discussion of her right to continue as mandatory upon ceasing to be a member of the League. Japan remained in the mandated territory after her withdrawal became final in 1935 and continued to submit annual reports to the League through the year 1938. Meanwhile, no League member raised officially the question of Japan's right to continue as mandatory power. After 1938 the islands were increasingly treated by Japan as a closed military area.

The Islands During the War

Upon the outbreak of World War II, Japan's rapid movement south and eastward into the Pacific at the same time her forces were overrunning southeastern Asia revealed with grim clarity the extent to which military preparations had been undertaken and operations projected which included use of the mandated islands as bases for aggression to the south and east. Japanese eastward aggression reached its apogee in the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7 and the hard-won landings at Wake Island on December 22, 1941. Guam fell to the aggressor on December 12.

Within less than three months, however, American naval units were engaging in defensive operations devised almost exclusively for protecting our shores and lines of communication from the enemy. Operations of this type in the central Pacific began by the raid on the Marshall and Gilbert Islands on February 1, 1942. Our victory in the Battle of Midway⁶ of June 3-6 removed the threat to Hawaii and the American west coast.

Over the next two years defensive operations gradually changed to full offensive attacks on enemy positions. In the autumn of 1943 carrier-based air strikes on Marcus, Tarawa, Apamama, and Wake Islands served to soften Japanese installations and keep the enemy guessing as to where the next full-scale attack would be delivered. Makin Island was captured on November 22, and after a four-day assault the heavily fortified island of Tarawa was taken on November 24, 1943. At the end of January 1944, large-scale offensive operations were undertaken in the Marshalls which continued throughout February. In the following two months extensive task-force raids were carried out in the western, central, and eastern Carolines. Heavy attacks on Truk and Ponape at the end of April were delivered by the fast-carrier task force returning from support of the Hollandia operation. The Marianas Islands operation took place during the summer of 1944 and resulted in the capture of Saipan, Guam, and Tinian, and the neutralization of the other islands of the Marianas. The western Carolines operation opened in September. Heavy assaults and stiffly resisted landings on Peleliu Island on September 15 were the principal steps in neutralizing all the Palau Islands. Thus, in part, the way was prepared for executing plans for the reoccupation of the Philippines and subsequent operations calculated to bring about the total defeat of Japan.

The Japanese Mandated Islands thus loomed large in the war in the Pacific. The foregoing chronology of naval operations⁷ recalls to mind

⁶The Korean Admiral Yi-San defeated the fleet of the Japanese Shogun Hideyoshi off the Korean coast in 1592. In this connection the statement has been made that the Battle of Midway was the first defeat suffered by the Japanese Navy in 350 years, which gives the false impression that there was a Japanese Navy in existence throughout that period.

⁷*U.S. Navy at War 1941-1945, Official Reports to the Secretary of the Navy by Commander in Chief, United States Fleet, and Chief of Naval Operations (Washington, 1946), passim.*

the magnitude of the price in human lives, effort, and matériel required to wrest them from the enemy. No member of the United Nations has suggested that Japan should ever be reestablished in them.

Present Status of Japanese and Japanese Mandated Islands

The Cairo Declaration of December 1, 1943, stated that:

" . . . Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the first World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed."

This declaration was reaffirmed by the proclamation issued by the heads of the Governments of the United States, China, and the United Kingdom on July 26, 1945, at Potsdam, and subsequently adhered to by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.⁸ Article 8 of the Potsdam Declaration stated:

"(8) The terms of the Cairo Declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku and such minor islands as we determined."

On September 2, 1945, Japan accepted these terms by the Instrument of Surrender.⁹

The application of the surrender terms to the islands of the Pacific formerly under the jurisdiction of Japan resulted in the United States acquiring responsibility for the present administration of a large number of them. United States military government is maintained at present in all outlying Japanese islands except the Kuriles and Southern Sakhalin, now under the control of the Government of the Soviet Union, and in Formosa, which is under the jurisdiction of China. The authority of General of the Army MacArthur extends to the

Ryukyu and Izu Islands which lie south and southeast of the main Japanese islands. All the other Japanese islands to the south and the former Japanese Mandated Islands are administered by the United States Navy under directives issued by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The position of the United States regarding the outlying Japanese islands and Japanese Mandated Islands has been clearly stated by President Truman, who announced on November 6, 1946: "The United States is prepared to place under trusteeship, with the United States as the administering authority, the Japanese Mandated Islands and any Japanese islands for which it assumes responsibilities as a result of the second World War."¹⁰ The President also stated that at an early date the United States planned to submit formally to the Security Council of the United Nations a draft trusteeship agreement for the former Japanese Mandated Islands.

Submission of the Trusteeship Agreement

The draft trusteeship agreement¹¹ to which the President referred was developed after long and careful consultations by the State, War, and Navy Departments. It contained the provisions whereby the United States was prepared to place the former Japanese Mandated Islands under international trusteeship. The draft agreement was made public on November 6, 1946, and copies were transmitted for information to the other members of the Security Council (Australia, Brazil, China, Egypt, France, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom) and to New Zealand and the Republic of the Philippines, and were later transmitted to the newly elected members of the Security Council (Belgium, Colombia, and Syria).

It was believed by some governments that the matter should be held over until the peace treaty with Japan. The United States maintained that it was proposing the agreement in full compliance with the trusteeship provisions of the Charter and was acting on the recommendation of the General Assembly of February 1946 which invited states administering former mandated territories to submit trusteeship proposals. Therefore, it saw no reason why this matter should be postponed, but was willing, after the formal presentation of its

⁸ BULLETIN of July 29, 1945, p. 137.

⁹ BULLETIN of Sept. 9, 1945, p. 364.

¹⁰ BULLETIN of Nov. 17, 1946, p. 889.

¹¹ For text of the draft agreement see BULLETIN of Nov. 17, 1946, p. 889.

and
the
mer
1 by
d by
the
ated
Tru-
The
steer-
ring any
ibil-
The
the
the
raft
nese

a the
and
and
sions
place
or in-
was
opies
ther
Bra-
her-
Re-
New
and
mem-
bia,

the
treaty
that
ance
and
geral
ates
sub-
w no
, but
f its

letin

trusteeship proposals, to consider such postponement as the Security Council might deem necessary.

On February 17, 1947, the text of the draft trusteeship agreement was submitted by the United States Representative to the United Nations, Warren R. Austin, to the Secretary-General with a request that the matter be placed on the agenda of the Security Council at an early date.¹² The matter was placed on the provisional agenda for the 113th meeting of the Security Council.¹³ The United States submitted the draft trusteeship agreement for approval by the Security Council, rather than by the General Assembly, because under its terms the territory is designated as strategic. This is in accordance with article 82 of the Charter, which provides that "There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory . . .", and article 83, which states that "All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements . . . shall be exercised by the Security Council."

Consideration by the Security Council

Mr. Austin formally submitted the United States draft trusteeship agreement to the Security Council on February 26, 1947.¹⁴ At the same time he submitted to the Security Council a paper containing the text of the draft agreement with article-by-article explanatory comments.¹⁵ The Security Council began consideration of the draft trusteeship agreement on March 7, 1947, and discussions on the question were continued at four later meetings held on March 12, 17, and 28, and April 2, 1947.

At the 116th meeting of the Security Council the Australian Representative proposed that the decision of the Security Council should be finally confirmed at the peace conference settling the Pacific war, and that states not members of the Security Council who were belligerents in that war should have an opportunity to discuss the terms of trusteeship. As indicated below, the first of these propositions was later withdrawn. In regard to the second proposition the Australian Representative proposed that a committee of the Council be established for the purpose of considering in detail

the draft trusteeship agreement; and that the committee should consist of representatives of countries having a direct interest in the future of the Japanese Mandated Islands, including representatives of such countries, not members of the Security Council, who might be invited to participate in the discussion of the question in accordance with article 31 of the Charter.

In reply to this proposition the United States Representative stated: "Four months ago, the countries who are not members of this Security Council were delivered copies for the purpose of studying them. This conduct was consistent with the principles and policies of the United States." In conclusion he asked: "Why is it that the Council is asked to take such action as this that is proposed here if these countries who have had notice, and if other countries who have not had notice but who have lived in circumstances where they are really charged with knowledge, have none of them—not one single one—come forward and asked to be heard? Why are we asked to pass that? I regret it very much, but I think it would not be acting equitably to pass this resolution."

In responding to this statement the Australian Representative declared that Australia's policy has been to support the United States policy in obtaining control of the islands, and that it was surprising that his resolution should be interpreted as an attempt to interfere with the attainment of that objective.

As debates¹⁶ on the issue continued, communications were received from the Governments of New Zealand and India requesting, under article 31 of the Charter, that they be allowed to participate in the discussions. The New Zealand Government also requested that those members of the Far Eastern Commission not represented in the Security Council be invited to participate, if they so desired, in the discussions. At its 118th meet-

¹² U.N. doc. S/281, Feb. 17, 1947.

¹³ U.N. doc. S/287, Feb. 21, 1947.

¹⁴ The complete statement by Mr. Austin in the Security Council is found in the BULLETIN of Mar. 9, 1947, p. 416.

¹⁵ BULLETIN of Mar. 9, 1947, p. 420.

¹⁶ Verbatim records of the Security Council discussions on the U. S. draft trusteeship agreement for the former Japanese Mandated Islands are contained in the following U. N. documents (1947): S/P. V. 113, Feb. 26; S/P. V. 116, Mar. 7; S/P. V. 118, Mar. 12; S/P. V. 119, Mar. 17; S/P. V. 123, Mar. 28; S/P. V. 124, Apr. 2.

ing the Security Council decided to grant these requests. Mr. Austin stated that the United States freely assented to the issuance of the proposed invitations, and Mr. Hasluck, the Australian Representative, treating the statement as a proposal, promptly supported it. The Security Council accordingly invited Canada, India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the Republic of the Philippines to be represented at subsequent discussions on the United States draft trusteeship agreement. The views of all of these states, whose representatives took an active part in the deliberations, were heard at the Council's table.

In a five-and-one-half-hour session on April 2, 1947, the Security Council reconsidered the entire agreement article by article. Well along in the discussions, during the debate on article 15 of the agreement, the Representative of Syria stated that the Council "was not giving implementation or the correct execution of article 79 of the Charter", because it "was paying no attention or no consideration at all to the States directly concerned." He believed "that the matter ought to be studied further in order to have this part of the work better understood and better defined." He moved to adjourn the meeting and to fix another meeting the following week so that all the representatives participating in the discussions might be able to study the matter and prepare a full discussion on the point of which are the "States directly concerned". This motion was lost by a 5 to 6 vote, which permitted the discussions to continue until the final vote on the agreement was taken.

In voting on proposed amendments the United States Representative followed the rule of casting a vote when the United States vote would be in the affirmative, and abstaining from voting in cases wherein the United States did not favor the proposal before the Council. He abstained, therefore, from voting on proposals to revise article 8(1) and article 15. Prior to the voting on each of these articles, the United States Representative declared that the United States would not veto the amendment. He made it clear in both cases, however, that if the United States had a vote it would, of course, vote "no". Thus, in advance of his first abstention, he stated that, "On questions such as this, it is perfectly clear—to us anyway—that the United States, when it may be obliged in view of its responsibilities to withdraw the tender of an agreement, should certainly not

exercise a veto in the Security Council also." Prior to his second abstention he said, "The United States being a party to the agreement, all I can do is, with the utmost modesty, state that an amendment in the nature of that proposed . . . probably could not be accepted by the United States as a party to the agreement."

At the close of the 124th meeting, the Security Council voted on the agreement as a whole, noting the various changes which had been passed. The Council approved unanimously the United States draft agreement including three minor amendments which had been accepted by the United States Representative upon instructions from his Government. The three amendments in the text of the agreement are as follows:

1. *Article 3.* An amendment was proposed by the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to delete the words *as an integral part of the United States*. Upon accepting this amendment at the 116th meeting of the Security Council, the United States Representative said, *inter alia*: "In agreeing to this modification, my Government feels that it should affirm for the record that its authority in the trust territory is not to be considered in any way lessened thereby."

2. *Article 6(1).* An amendment was proposed by the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and revised in the Council, to add after the words *toward self-government* the words *or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned*. In accepting modification in article 6(1) at the 116th meeting of the Security Council, the United States Representative declared that "the United States feels that it must record its opposition not to the principle of independence, to which no people could be more consecrated than the people of the United States, but to the thought that it could possibly be achieved within any foreseeable future in this case."

3. *Article 6(1).* An amendment was suggested by the Representatives of New Zealand and India and introduced on behalf of the latter at the 124th meeting of the Security Council, to delete the word *local* from the phrase *in local government*. The observation of the Representative of India at the 124th meeting in behalf of this deletion was that in certain countries the word *local* connotes mu-

nicipal government, and that surely would not be the intention of the Representative of the United States.

In the final consideration of the United States trusteeship proposals, the original text of articles 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 19 was approved in each case without objection or comment. The United States Representative, Mr. Austin, requested that article 6(2) be perfected by putting a comma in the second line after the word *inhabitants*. He also requested that article 7 be perfected as follows:

"Article 7. In discharging its obligations under Article 76(c), of the Charter, the administering authority shall guarantee to the inhabitants of the trust territory freedom of conscience, and, subject only to the requirements of public order and security, freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly; freedom of worship, and of religious teaching; and freedom of migration and movement."

Mr. Austin stated: "The significance of this perfection of the article is that it moves up freedom of conscience so that it will not be subject to the requirements of public order and security."

The approval of the trusteeship agreement with the three minor amendments and these two slight changes followed the withdrawal or rejection of several other proposed amendments as follows:

1. *The Preamble.* Discussions on the preamble concerned three alternative versions—suggested by Poland, the Netherlands, and the United States—of an amendment proposed originally by the Representative of Poland at the 116th meeting of the Security Council. This proposal was to add the following phrase to paragraph four: "Whereas Japan has violated the terms of the above-mentioned mandate of the League of Nations and has thus forfeited her mandate . . .". The United States Representative endorsed this proposal, but the amendment was reconsidered at the 124th meeting. The Netherlands Representative proposed that the amendment read: "Whereas, as a result of the signature by Japan of an act of unconditional surrender, the mandate held by Japan for these islands has come to an end". As a compromise, the United States Representative proposed the following wording: "Whereas the mandate held by Japan for these islands has come to an end". After failure to reach agreement on these alterna-

tive proposals, the original wording of the Preamble was approved unanimously.

2. *Article 8(1).* The United Kingdom Representative proposed an amendment to article 8(1) to delete the phrase *except the administering authority*, holding that the inclusion of these words would give preferential position to the United States, which did not seem to be in strict accordance with articles 83(2) and 76(d) of the Charter. He asked whether the phrase in article 83(3) *without prejudice to security considerations* would not really give the United States sufficient safeguard. After replying to this question in the negative, the United States Representative stated for the record:

" . . . the United States Government has no intention, through this clause or any other clause, of taking advantage for its own benefit, and to the detriment of the welfare of the inhabitants, of the meager and almost non-existent resources and commercial opportunities that exist in the scattered and barren islands. The nature of this proposed clause is dictated by the fact that these islands are proposed as a strategic trusteeship area and by the obligations which the administering authority will assume under the Charter 'to further international peace and security' and to insure that the territory itself 'shall play its part' in the maintenance of international peace and security."

3. *Article 13.* The United Kingdom Representative proposed a redraft of article 13 to read:

"The provisions of article 87 and 88 of the Charter shall be applicable to the trust territory, provided that the administering authority may at any time inform the Security Council, in accordance with article 83(3) of the Charter, that security considerations do not permit the exercise of the functions of the Trusteeship Council in regard to specific areas."

He did not insist on this amendment, however, because the United States Representative stated for the record that the United States contemplates that notification shall be made to the Security Council whenever the proviso that is contained in article 13 comes into use.

4. *Article 15.* Extended debate took place before reaching agreement on article 15. Two formal amendments to this article were presented by the Representatives of Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Soviet amendment was

to make article 15 read as follows: "The terms of the present agreement may be altered and amended or the terms of its validity discontinued by decision of the Security Council." The Polish amendment was to modify article 15 to read: "The terms of the present agreement shall not be altered, amended or terminated except as provided by the Charter." At an earlier meeting the United States Representative indicated a willingness to accept the following text as a compromise: "The terms of the present agreement shall not be altered, amended, or terminated except by agreement of the administering authority and the Security Council." Following the rejection of the Soviet and Polish amendments he indicated that the United States compromise proposal was not now pending. Thus, there was pending only the original article 15 which the Council voted to accept.

5. *Proposed Article 17.* An issue debated at length in the Security Council was embodied in an amendment proposed by Australia to add an article 17 to the agreement which would have delayed its coming into force until the effective date of the peace treaty with Japan. The view thus expressed was supported by the United Kingdom and by New Zealand. The United States Representative argued most forcefully against this proposal, which would have left the agreement in suspense for an indefinite period. He emphasized throughout the debates the basic contention of the United States Government that the matter did not depend upon, and need not await, the general peace settlement with Japan. Following the Security Council's decision to widen its discussions

to include representatives of Canada, India, the Netherlands, and the Republic of the Philippines for the purpose of stating their views on the United States trusteeship proposals, the Australian Representative stated: "The result of this will be to extend the Security Council, for the time being, into a small replica of the Conference of Nations which would be entitled, as a matter of justice and democratic right, to participate in the final settlement with Japan." For this reason and in the interests of a unanimous decision, the Australian-proposed amendment to add a new article 17 was withdrawn.

According to article 16 of the agreement, the Security Council having approved the terms of trusteeship, only the approval by the United States in accordance with its constitutional process is now required to bring the trusteeship agreement into force. When that is accomplished, the islands of Micronesia formerly mandated to Japan will be known officially, according to article 1 of the agreement, as the Territory of the Pacific Islands. The coming into force of the trusteeship agreement will require a change in the membership of the Trusteeship Council. Article 86(1)(c) of the Charter provides that the number of members of the Trusteeship Council is to be equally divided between those members of the United Nations which administer trust territories and those which do not. Hence, when the United States is confirmed as the administering authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, it will be necessary for the General Assembly to elect two additional members which do not administer trust territories.

Trusteeship Agreement for the Former Japanese Mandated Islands¹

APPROVED AT THE 124th MEETING OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Preamble

WHEREAS Article 75 of the Charter of the United Nations provides for the establishment of an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent agreements; and

WHEREAS under Article 77 of the said Charter the trusteeship system may be applied to territories now held under mandate; and

WHEREAS on 17 December 1920 the Council of the League of Nations confirmed a mandate for the former German islands north of the equator to Japan, to be administered in accordance with Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations; and

WHEREAS Japan, as a result of the Second World War, has ceased to exercise any authority in these islands;

Now, therefore, the Security Council of the United Nations, having satisfied itself that the relevant articles of the Charter have been complied with, hereby resolves to approve the following terms of trusteeship for the Pacific Islands formerly under mandate to Japan.

Article 1

The Territory of the Pacific Islands, consisting of the islands formerly held by Japan under mandate in accordance with Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, is hereby designated as a strategic area and placed under the trusteeship system established in the Charter of the United Nations. The Territory of the Pacific Islands is hereinafter referred to as the trust territory.

Article 2

The United States of America is designated as the administering authority of the trust territory.

Article 3

The administering authority shall have full powers of administration, legislation, and juris-

diction over the territory subject to the provisions of this agreement,² and may apply to the trust territory, subject to any modifications which the administering authority may consider desirable, such of the laws of the United States as it may deem appropriate to local conditions and requirements.

Article 4

The administering authority, in discharging the obligations of trusteeship in the trust territory, shall act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and the provisions of this agreement, and shall, as specified in Article 83(2) of the Charter, apply the objectives of the international trusteeship system, as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter, to the people of the trust territory.

Article 5

In discharging its obligations under Article 76(a) and Article 84, of the Charter, the administering authority shall ensure that the trust territory shall play its part, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority shall be entitled:

1. to establish naval, military and air bases and to erect fortifications in the trust territory;
2. to station and employ armed forces in the territory; and
3. to make use of volunteer forces, facilities and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for the local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

¹ See document S/281 for the original draft agreement submitted by the Representative of the United States. [Footnote in the original, document S/318, Apr. 2, 1947.]

See BULLETIN of Nov. 17, 1946, p. 889; Mar. 9, 1947, p. 416; and Mar. 23, 1947, p. 511.

² In the final text approved by the Security Council on Apr. 2, 1947, article 3 was amended by deletion of the phrase as an integral part of the United States.

Article 6

In discharging its obligations under Article 76(b) of the Charter, the administering authority shall:

1. foster the development of such political institutions as are suited to the trust territory and shall promote the development of the inhabitants of the trust territory toward self-government³ or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; and to this end shall give to the inhabitants of the trust territory a progressively increasing share in the administrative services in the territory; shall develop their participation in⁴ government; shall give due recognition to the customs of the inhabitants in providing a system of law for the territory; and shall take other appropriate measures toward these ends;

2. promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants, and to this end shall regulate the use of natural resources; encourage the development of fisheries, agriculture, and industries; protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources; and improve the means of transportation and communication;

3. promote the social advancement of the inhabitants and to this end shall protect the rights and fundamental freedoms of all elements of the population without discrimination; protect the health of the inhabitants; control the traffic in arms and ammunition, opium and other dangerous drugs, and alcohol and other spirituous [spirituous] beverages; and institute such other regulations as may be necessary to protect the inhabitants against social abuses; and

4. promote the educational advancement of the inhabitants, and to this end shall take steps toward the establishment of a general system of elemen-

³ As finally approved by the Security Council on Apr. 2, 1947, article 6(1) was amended to add after the words *toward self-government*, the words *or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned*.

⁴ Article 6(1) was also amended by deletion of the word *local* in the phrase *in local government*.

⁵ As finally approved by the Security Council of Apr. 2, 1947, the text of article 7 contains a slight revision, requested by the United States Representative, whereby *freedom of conscience* is moved forward so that it is not subject to the requirements of public order and security.

tary education; facilitate the vocational and cultural advancement of the population; and shall encourage qualified students to pursue higher education, including training on the professional level.

Article 7

In discharging its obligations under Article 76(c) of the Charter, the administering authority shall guarantee to the inhabitants of the trust territory freedom of conscience,⁵ and, subject only to the requirements of public order and security, freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly; freedom of worship, and of religious teaching; and freedom of migration and movement.

Article 8

1. In discharging its obligations under Article 76(d) of the Charter, as defined by Article 83(2) of the Charter, the administering authority, subject to the requirements of security, and the obligation to promote the advancement of the inhabitants, shall accord to nationals of each Member of the United Nations and to companies and associations organized in conformity with the laws of such Member, treatment in the trust territory no less favourable than that accorded therein to nationals, companies and associations of any other United Nation except the administering authority.

2. The administering authority shall ensure equal treatment to the Members of the United Nations and their nationals in the administration of justice.

3. Nothing in this Article shall be so construed as to accord traffic rights to aircraft flying into and out of the trust territory. Such rights shall be subject to agreement between the administering authority and the state whose nationality such aircraft possesses.

4. The administering authority may negotiate and conclude commercial and other treaties and agreements with Members of the United Nations and other states, designed to attain for the inhabitants of the trust territory treatment by the Members of the United Nations and other states no less favourable than that granted by them to the nationals of other states. The Security Council may recommend, or invite other organs of the United Nations to consider and recommend, what rights the inhabitants of the trust territory should

(Continued on page 794)

THE COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS

Moscow Meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers: Discussion of German and Austrian Draft Treaties

STATEMENTS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Reiteration of Position on Disarmament and Demilitarization of Germany¹

The United States proposal for a Four Power treaty for the disarmament and demilitarization of Germany which we discussed here is not mentioned in the Deputies' report. I am not suggesting that it be included. The principle involved is in my opinion too fundamental to be referred to any subordinate body. I do not intend to repeat all the various considerations which led the Government of the United States to propose this treaty, nor the reasons why it attaches the greatest importance to this subject. I will only state that the United States Government regards very seriously what in effect is the virtual rejection of this treaty by the Soviet Government. I say rejection because the redraft proposed by Mr. Molotov introduces into the treaty nearly every important difference which exists between the Four Powers on the subject of Germany, and thus renders obviously impossible any hope of concluding such a treaty at this time.

An agreement in principle here along the lines proposed by the United States would have been indication to the world that despite the character and extent of our disagreements on other aspects of the German problem, the Four Powers represented at this table were at least united in their determination to prevent the revival of Germany's capacity to make war. The advantages of such a clear demonstration of Allied intentions, not only on the future solution of other problems connected with Germany but on the whole international situation, appear so obvious that the United States finds it difficult to understand the reasons which account for the Soviet Government's declining to agree. Although we must face the fact that because of this attitude there is no prospect of an agreement on this treaty at this conference, the

United States is not withdrawing its proposal for such a treaty.

Position on Treaty for Reestablishment of Independent and Democratic Austria¹

I should like to turn again to the matter of the Austrian treaty. I think we must decide now whether we can or cannot conclude the Austrian treaty here. As Mr. Molotov has several times made clear, the main outstanding issue is article 35, dealing with German assets in Austria. The British, French, and American Delegations have put forward various proposals in an effort to meet as far as possible the Soviet position. I refer particularly to the last proposal put forward by the United States Delegation last week and that put forward by the British Delegation yesterday. There is no substantial difference in the views of the British, French, and American Delegations on this subject.

The Soviet Delegation, according to my understanding, has not in any substantial way withdrawn from the proposal it made at the session of the Deputies in London last February. The views expressed by the Soviet Delegation have widened rather than narrowed our differences. The three other delegations have made clear that they cannot accept the Soviet proposal because it would oblige the Austrian Government to hand over not only *bona fide* German assets but property which the Germans had taken from Austrians and others by fraud and duress. We do not believe that the Soviet proposal on German assets in Austria is consistent with the pledge made at Potsdam that no reparations would be taken from Austria, and with the pledge made in article

¹ Made on Apr. 23, 1947, and released to the press in Moscow on the same date, and in Washington on Apr. 24. The Council concluded its Moscow session on Apr. 24.

THE COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS

1 of the Austrian treaty,² to reestablish Austria as a sovereign, independent, and democratic state. The three other delegations have urged the Soviet Delegation to submit proposals which would meet this objection, but despite our urging no new proposal has been offered us by the Soviet Delegation.

It is clear now that no agreement can be reached on the Austrian treaty if the Soviet Delegation is unwilling to make any greater effort than it has made so far to reach an understanding on German assets in Austria. Unless, therefore, the Soviet Delegation has some concrete proposal to make on this subject, which will make clear that German assets do not include assets which in justice and equity should be restored to non-Germans, we must accept the fact that further progress in the Austrian treaty is impossible at this conference.

I have one further suggestion to make. If we are unable to reconcile our views before the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in September, I hope that we may join in asking the General Assembly to make recommendations on this subject under article 14. It is our view that we should not permit differences among us to deny to Austria her independence and her right to be free from the burdens of occupation.

Trusteeship Agreement—Continued from page 792

acquire in consideration of the rights obtained by Members of the United Nations in the trust territory.

Article 9

The administering authority shall be entitled to constitute the trust territory into a customs, fiscal, or administrative union or federation with other territories under United States jurisdiction and to establish common services between such territories and the trust territory where such measures are not inconsistent with the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System and with the terms of this agreement.

Article 10

The administering authority, acting under the provisions of Article 3 of this agreement, may accept membership in any regional advisory com-

² Referring to the treaty drafted at London January-February 1947 by the Foreign Ministers' Deputies.

mission, regional authority, or technical organization, or other voluntary association of states, may co-operate with specialized international bodies, public or private, and may engage in other forms of international co-operation.

Article 11

1. The administering authority shall take the necessary steps to provide the status of citizenship of the trust territory for the inhabitants of the trust territory.

2. The administering authority shall afford diplomatic and consular protection to inhabitants of the trust territory when outside the territorial limits of the trust territory or of the territory of the administering authority.

Article 12

The administering authority shall enact such legislation as may be necessary to place the provisions of this agreement in effect in the trust territory.

Article 13

The provisions of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter shall be applicable to the trust territory, provided that the administering authority may determine the extent of their applicability to any areas which may from time to time be specified by it as closed for security reasons.

Article 14

The administering authority undertakes to apply in the trust territory the provisions of any international conventions and recommendations which may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and which would be conducive to the achievement of the basic objectives of Article 6 of this agreement.

Article 15

The terms of the present agreement shall not be altered, amended or terminated without the consent of the administering authority.

Article 16

The present agreement shall come into force when approved by the Security Council of the United Nations and by the Government of the United States after due constitutional process.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Special Session of General Assembly Called

CABLE SENT BY SECRETARY-GENERAL TO MEMBER NATIONS

Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, cabled on April 13 the 55 members of the United Nations, calling a special session of the General Assembly for Monday, April 28, at General Assembly Hall at Flushing, to consider the Palestine question.

The cables were sent following approval of the special session by 29 countries, one more than the required majority. Affirmative replies came from Canada on April 12 and from the Philippine Republic and Turkey on April 13. The text of the cable follows:

"Have honour inform you that a majority of Members have today concurred in the request of United Kingdom to summon a special session of General Assembly. In accordance with rules 3 and 8 of provisional rules of procedure of General Assembly I hereby notify you that special session will open on Monday 28 April 1947 at eleven a.m. in General Assembly Hall Flushing Meadows New York City.

"Provisional agenda of special session follows:

- "1. Opening of session by Chairman of Belgian Delegation
- "2. Election and report of credentials committee
- "3. Election of President
- "4. Organization of the session
- "5. Adoption of agenda
- "6. Constituting and instructing special committee to prepare for consideration of the question of Palestine at second regular session.

"TRYGVE LIE
"Secretary-General"

The countries which have replied up to April 13 are Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippine Republic, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States. All replies so far have been in favor of the proposal for a special General Assembly.

ITEMS REQUESTED FOR AGENDA

Text of letter from the United Kingdom Delegation to the United Nations¹

2nd April, 1947.

SIR:

I have received the following message from my Government:

"His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom request the Secretary-General of the United

Nations to place the question of Palestine on the Agenda of the General Assembly at its next regular Annual Session. They will submit to the Assembly an account of their administration of the League of Nations Mandate and will ask the Assembly to make recommendations, under Article 10 of the Charter, concerning the future government of Palestine.

¹ General Assembly doc. A/286, Apr. 3, 1947.

THE UNITED NATIONS

"In making this request, His Majesty's Government draw the attention of the Secretary-General to the desirability of an early settlement in Palestine and to the risk that the General Assembly might not be able to decide upon its recommendations at its next regular Annual Session unless some preliminary study of the question had previously been made under the auspices of the United Nations. They therefore request the Secretary-General to summon, as soon as possible, a special Session of the General Assembly for the purpose of constituting and instructing a Special Committee to prepare for the consideration, at the regular Session of the Assembly, of the question referred to in the preceding paragraph."

I have the honour [etc.]

ALEXANDER CADOGAN

Dr. VICTOR CHI TSAI Hoo

Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations, Lake Success

Text of telegram sent on April 2, 1947, by the Acting Secretary-General to all members of the United Nations except the United Kingdom²

Have honor notify you that on 2 April United Kingdom Government requested Secretary-General to place question of Palestine on agenda next regular session of General Assembly. In accordance with rule 4 provisional rules procedure General Assembly have honor inform you that United Kingdom Government further requested Secretary-General in view of desirability of an early settlement in Palestine to summon special session General Assembly as soon as possible for purpose of constituting and instructing a special committee to prepare for the consideration of above question at next regular session. Therefore have honor inquire whether your government concurs in summoning special session for this purpose and to request you notify me of its decision. If within 30 days majority of members concur, special session will be convoked in accordance rules 3 and

8 and provisional agenda circulated in accordance rule 11.

VICTOR HOO
Acting Secretary-General

Text of letter from the Ambassador of Iraq in the United States to the Secretary-General³

21 April 1947.

EXCELLENCY:

I have the honor to inform you that I have been instructed by my Government to request you, in accordance with Rule 18 of the Provisional Rules

NOTE: The rules referred to are as follows (General Assembly doc. A/71/Rev. 1, Apr. 28, 1947):

Rule 3: Special sessions of the General Assembly shall also be held within fifteen days of the receipt by the Secretary-General of a request for such a session either from the Security Council or from a majority of the Members of the United Nations.

Rule 4: Any Member of the United Nations may request the Secretary-General to summon a special session. The Secretary-General shall thereupon inform the other Members of the United Nations of the request and inquire whether they concur in it. If within thirty days of the date of the communication a majority of the Members concur in the request, a special session of the General Assembly shall be summoned in accordance with the provisions of Rule 3.

Rule 8: The Secretary-General shall notify the Members of the United Nations at least fourteen days in advance of the opening of a special session convoked at the request of the Security Council, and at least ten days in the case of a request by a majority of the Members.

Rule 11: The provisional Agenda for a regular session shall be communicated to the Members of the United Nations at least sixty days before the opening of the session. The provisional Agenda of a special session, summoned at the request of the Security Council, shall be communicated at least fourteen days before the opening of the session. The provisional Agenda of a special session, summoned at the request of a majority of the Members, shall be communicated at least ten days before the opening of the session.

Rule 18: Any Member of the United Nations may, at least four days before the date fixed for the opening of a special session, request the inclusion of additional items in the Agenda. Such items shall be placed on a supplementary list which shall be communicated to the Members of the United Nations as soon as possible.

² General Assembly doc. A/295, Apr. 25, 1947.

³ General Assembly doc. A/288, Apr. 23, 1947.

THE UNITED NATIONS

of Procedure for the General Assembly, to include the following as an additional item in the Agenda of the Special Session of the General Assembly convening on April 28, 1947:

The Termination of the Mandate over Palestine and the Declaration of its Independence.

Please accept [etc.]

ALI JAWDAT
The Ambassador

Text of telegram from Egyptian Ambassador in the United States to the Secretary-General:⁴

WASHINGTON D.C.
April 21, 1947

His Excellency TRYGVE LIE

Secretary-General, United Nations

SIR: I have the honour to advise that according to instructions received from my Government and in conformity of article 18 of the provisional rules of procedure of the General Assembly the Royal Egyptian Government requests to include the following additional item on the agenda of the forthcoming extraordinary meeting of the United Nations General Assembly which is to deal with the question of Palestine on the 28th of April 1947. The item reads as follows: The termination of the mandate over Palestine and the declaration of its independence. Accept Sir the assurances of my highest consideration.

MAHMOUD HASSAN
Egyptian Ambassador

Text of telegram from the Syrian Minister in the United States to the Secretary-General⁵

22 April 1947.

TRYGVE LIE:

I have the honor to inform you that I have been instructed by my Government to request you, in accordance with Rule 18 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, to include the following as additional item in the Agenda of the Special Session of the General Assembly

May 4, 1947

741062-47-3

convening on April 28, 1947: The termination of the mandate over Palestine and the declaration of its independence.

Please accept [etc.]

COSTI K. ZURAYK
Minister of Syria

Text of telegram from the Lebanese Minister in the United States to the Secretary-General⁶

22 April 1947.

TRYGVE LIE:

Excellency I have the honor to state that I am instructed by my Government to request in accordance with Rule 18 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure for the procedure of the General Assembly the inclusion of the following additional item in the Agenda of the forthcoming Special Session of the General Assembly scheduled to open on April 28, 1947: "The termination of the mandate on and the granting of independence to Palestine".

Accept [etc.]

CHARLES MALIK
*Minister of Lebanon
in the United States*

Text of letter from the Saudi-Arabian Minister in the United States to the Secretary-General⁷

April 22, 1947.

EXCELLENCY:

I have been instructed by my Government to request, in accordance with Rule 18 Provisional Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, that the following item be put on the Agenda of the Special Session which convenes on April 28th, 1947.

"The termination of the mandate over Palestine and the declaration of its independence."

Accept [etc.]

ASAD AL-FAQIH
Minister

⁴ General Assembly doc. A/287, Apr. 21, 1947.

⁵ General Assembly doc. A/289, Apr. 23, 1947.

⁶ General Assembly doc. A/290, Apr. 23, 1947.

⁷ General Assembly doc. A/291, Apr. 23, 1947.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION

[Released to the press April 25]

The following is the list of the United States Delegation to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Palestine question which convenes at New York on April 28, 1947:

United States Representative

Warren R. Austin

Alternate United States Representative

Herschel V. Johnson

Advisers

William Cargo, Division of Dependent Area Affairs, Department of State

William Dawson, retired Foreign Service officer

Wilder Foote,¹ Director of Information, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations

Loy Henderson, Director, Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, Department of State

Gordon Knox,¹ Adviser, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations

Robert McClintock, Special Assistant to the Director, Office of Special Political Affairs, Department of State
Charles Noyes,¹ Adviser, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations

Hayden Raynor, Special Assistant to the Director, Office of European Affairs, Department of State

John C. Ross,¹ Deputy to the U.S. Representative to the United Nations

William Sanders, Associate Chief, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State

Henry Villard, Deputy Director, Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, Department of State

Fraser Wilkins, Division of Near Eastern Affairs, Department of State

Public Liaison Officer

Chester Williams¹

Special Assistant to the U.S. Representative

William Mills¹

Secretary-General

Richard Winslow¹

Deputy Secretary-General

Thomas Power¹

Designating the United States Mission to the United Nations and Providing for Its Direction and Administration²

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 619) and as President of the United States, and for the purpose of defining further the functions of the Representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. The Representative at the seat of the United Nations, the Deputy Representative to the Security Council, Representatives in the Economic and Social Council and its Commissions, the Trusteeship Council, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Commission for Conventional Armaments and the Military Staff Committee, and representatives to

organs and agencies of the United Nations hereafter appointed or designated and included within the United States Mission to the United Nations herein provided for, together with their deputies, staffs and offices, shall be known as the United States Mission to the United Nations.

2. The Representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations shall be the Chief of Mission in charge of the United States Mission to the United Nations. The Chief of Mission shall coordinate at the seat of the United Nations the activities of the Mission in carrying out the instructions of the President transmitted either by the Secretary of State or by other means of transmission as directed by the President. Instructions to the Representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations shall be transmitted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On request of the Chief of Mission, such

¹ Detailed from the permanent staff of the U.S. Representative at the seat of the United Nations.

² Ex. Or. 9844 (12 *Federal Register* 2765).

Representatives shall, in addition to their responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, serve as advisers in the United States Mission to the United Nations.

3. The Chief of Mission shall also be responsible for the administration of the Mission, including personnel, budget, obligation and expenditure of funds, and the central administrative services; provided that he shall not be responsible for the internal administration of the personnel, budget, and obligation and expenditure of funds of the

United States Representatives in the Military Staff Committee. The Chief of Mission shall discharge his responsibilities under this paragraph in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may from time to time prescribe.

4. This order shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE

April 28, 1947

Summary Statement by the Secretary-General

MATTERS OF WHICH THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS SEIZED AND THE STAGE REACHED IN THEIR CONSIDERATION¹

9. Incidents in the Corfu Channel (consideration of this item was completed this week)

At the one hundred and twenty-fifth meeting on 3 April, the Representative of the United Kingdom submitted a new draft resolution which was adopted by the Council at the one hundred and twenty-seventh meeting on 9 April 1947 by eight votes in favour with two abstentions. The Resolution recommended that the United Kingdom and Albanian Governments should immediately refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court (document S/324).

The Council is therefore no longer seized of this matter.

7. The Greek Question (See also document S/279)²

The Greek Question was placed on the agenda of the one hundred and twenty-third meeting on 28 March 1947 at the request of the Representative of the United States to make a statement. The discussion continued at the one hundred and twenty-sixth, twenty-eighth, twenty-ninth, thirtieth and thirty-first meetings on 7, 10, 14 and 18 April with Representatives of Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria participating. Draft resolutions were introduced by the Representatives of the United States (S/P.V./126, p. 47) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (S/P.V./131, p. 97). The Representative of the United States accepted

amendments submitted by the Representative of France (S/P.V./126, p. 72 and S/P.V./131, p. 56). An amendment to the draft resolution of the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was submitted by the Representative of Poland (S/P.V./130, p. 69).

The Council adopted the amended United States draft resolution, resolving that pending a new decision of the Security Council, the commission established by the resolution of the Council of 19 October 1946, shall maintain in the area concerned a subsidiary group, composed of a representative of each of the members of the commission, to continue to fulfil such functions as the commission may prescribe, in accordance with its terms of reference (document S/330).

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' resolution and Polish amendment were not carried.

8. The General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments and Information on Armed Forces (see also document S/279)

The Commission for Conventional Armaments was convened on 24 March 1947 and commenced its task under its terms of reference.

¹ Security Council doc. S/327, Apr. 11, 1947. This summary supplements the one printed in the BULLETIN of Apr. 13, 1947, p. 657. The omitted parts correspond substantially to the material formerly printed.

² Items 7 and 8 are printed from Security Council doc. S/331, Apr. 18, 1947, and supplement the material printed in the BULLETIN of Apr. 13.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings¹

In Session as of April 27, 1947		1946	
Far Eastern Commission		Washington	Feb. 26
United Nations:			
Security Council		Lake Success	Mar. 25
Military Staff Committee		Lake Success	Mar. 25
Commission on Atomic Energy		Lake Success	June 14
Commission on Conventional Armaments		Lake Success	Mar. 24
Trusteeship Council		Lake Success	Mar. 26-Apr. 28
Meeting of Experts on Passport and Frontier Formalities		Geneva	Apr. 14
Trusteeship Council Questionnaire Committee		Lake Success	Apr. 15-23
German External Property Negotiations (Safehaven):			1946
With Portugal		Lisbon	Sept. 3
With Spain		Madrid	Nov. 12
Inter-Allied Trade Board for Japan		Washington	Oct. 24
International Conference on Trade and Employment: Second Meeting of Preparatory Committee.		Geneva	Apr. 10
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) European-Mediterranean Special Air Traffic Control Committee.		Paris	Apr. 15
Fifth International Hydrographic Conference		Monaco	Apr. 22
ILO (International Labor Organization) Industrial Committee on Coal Mining.		Geneva	Apr. 22-May 3
American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood: Meeting of the International Council.		Montevideo	Apr. 25-28
Scheduled for April-June 1947			
FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization):			
International Timber Conference		Marianske-Lazne, Czechoslovakia.	Apr. 28-May 10
Rice Study Group		Trivandrum, Travancore, India.	May 15
Executive Committee		Washington	June 2
International Meeting of Marine Radio Aids to Navigation		New York and New London	Apr. 28-May 10
United Nations:			
General Assembly: Special Session		Flushing Meadows	Apr. 28
Economic Commission for Europe:			
First Session		Geneva	May 2
Transport Session		Geneva	May 12 ²
Second Session		Geneva	June 23 ²

¹ Prepared in the Division of International Conferences, Department of State.

² Tentative.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

		1947
United Nations—Continued		
Committee on Progressive Development and Codification of International Law.	Lake Success	May 12 ²
Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East:		
First Session	Shanghai	June 5 ²
Committee of the Whole	Lake Success	June 23 ²
Preparatory Conference of Experts on Telecommunications	Lake Success	June 16 ²
ECOSOC (Economic and Social Council):		
Fiscal Commission	Lake Success	May 19 ²
Subcommission on Freedom of Information and of the Press	Lake Success	May 19 ²
Subcommission on Statistical Sampling	Lake Success	June 2 ²
Economic and Employment Commission	Lake Success	June 2 ²
Human Rights Drafting Committee	Lake Success	June 9 ²
ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization):		
Air Transport Committee	Montreal	Apr. 28
Interim Council	Montreal	Apr. 29
First Meeting of General Assembly	Montreal	May 6
South American Regional Air Navigation Meeting	Lima	June 17
IRO (International Refugee Organization): Second Part of First Session of Preparatory Commission.	Lausanne	May 1
ILO (International Labor Organization):		
Industrial Committee on Inland Transport	Geneva	May 6
102d Session of Governing Body	Geneva	June 13
30th Session of International Labor Conference	Geneva	June 19
Congress of the Universal Postal Union	Paris	May 6
Central Rhine Commission	Strasbourg	May 7-8
International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts: 16th Session.	Montreal	May 10
German External Property Negotiations With Turkey (Safe-haven).	Ankara	May 12 ²
International Radio Conference	Atlantic City	May 15
PMCC (Provisional Maritime Consultative Council)	Paris	May 16
IEFC (International Emergency Food Council): Fourth Meeting	Washington	May 26-27
Eleventh International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy.	Basel	June 2-7
ECITO (European Central Inland Transport Organization): Seventh Session of the Council (Second Part).	Paris	June 3
International Cotton Advisory Committee	Washington	June 9
Caribbean Commission: Fourth Meeting	Jamaica	June 23-30
IARA (Inter-Allied Reparation Agency): Meeting on Conflicting Custodial Claims.	Brussels	June

² Tentative.

Toward Formulating a New Japanese Constitution

FEC Interest in Japanese Constitution¹

The Commission has received from the United States Government the text of a draft constitution which appears to have been drawn up in compliance with an Imperial rescript, the text of which has also been supplied by the United States Government, along with the Supreme Commander's comments on that text.

The opening sentences of this draft indicate to the Commission that it will be presented to the first session of the Japanese Diet which will be chosen at the forthcoming general elections. The Commission therefore assumes that this and possibly other texts will be debated in the Diet and that amendments may be offered and perhaps other proposals introduced.

The Commission, therefore, desires that the Supreme Commander keep it informed of the progress and development of this and other drafts that may be considered by the Diet.

For mindful of its responsibilities under its Terms of Reference for the formulation of policy in regard to the implementation of the surrender terms, and of the important bearing which this or any other proposed changes in the constitutional structure of Japan may have upon the decisions in carrying out that responsibility, the Commission desires that the Supreme Commander for the Allies make clear to the Japanese Government that the Far Eastern Commission must be given an opportunity to pass upon the final draft of the constitution to determine whether it is consistent with the Potsdam Declaration and any other controlling document before it is finally approved by the Diet and becomes legally valid.

The Commission believes that in this way hasty action by the Japanese Diet will be prevented and

¹ Policy decision approved by the Far Eastern Commission on Mar. 20, 1946, and released to the press on Apr. 18, 1947. A directive based upon this decision was forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for implementation.

² Policy decision approved by the Far Eastern Commission on July 2, 1946, and released to the press on Apr. 18, 1947. A directive based upon this decision was forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for implementation.

time given for all elements inside and outside the Diet to consider this very important question and bring to that consideration all available thought produced by the freely expressed will of the Japanese people.

In this connection the Commission notes the encouragement given to the Japanese people in the Supreme Commander's announcement that this draft of a proposed constitution has his personal approval. It is somewhat apprehensive that this approval may be misunderstood by the Japanese public and taken to mean that this particular draft has the approval of the Powers represented on this Commission.

As such is not necessarily the case and as the Commission does not want to take any action in regard to this or any other draft constitution that might prejudice Japanese public opinion for or against any proposal of this nature, it considers that the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers should in some appropriate manner make it known to the Japanese people that while this draft of a proposed constitution is a document of obvious merit and is available now for consideration and study, the fact that it is a draft prepared by the Government does not preclude favorable consideration of other proposals or drafts which may be submitted to the Diet for study and comparison.

The Commission requests that the United States Government inform the Supreme Commander of its views as expressed above, and since the constitutional issue is one that is likely to influence the votes of the electors, it do so with a minimum of delay.

Basic Principles for a New Japanese Constitution²

1. The Japanese Constitution should recognize that sovereign power resides in the people. It should be so framed as to provide for:

a. A representative government based upon universal adult suffrage consisting of:

- (1) An executive, deriving its authority from and responsible to either the electorate or a fully representative legislative body;

(2) A legislature, fully representative of the electorate, which should have full legislative powers including full control over raising of public revenue and expenditure of public funds;

b. The establishment of an independent judiciary;

c. The guarantee of fundamental civil rights to all Japanese and to all persons within Japanese jurisdiction. All Japanese shall enjoy equal rights before the law and no special privileges of particular social groups such as the nobility shall be allowed;

d. The popular election of heads of institutions of local government such as prefectures, cities, towns, and villages;

e. The popular election of local assemblies such as prefectural, city, town, and village;

f. The adoption of constitutional amendments in a manner which will give effect to the freely expressed will of the Japanese people.

2. Though the ultimate form of government in Japan is to be established by the freely expressed will of the Japanese people, the retention of the Emperor Institution in its present constitutional form is not considered consistent with the foregoing general objectives. Consequently, the Japanese should be encouraged to abolish the Emperor Institution or to reform it along more democratic lines.

3. If the Japanese people decide that the Emperor Institution is not to be retained, constitutional safeguards against the institution will obviously not be required, but the constitution will have to conform to the requirements of paragraph 1 and shall also provide:

a. That the legislation shall have sole authority over financial measures and any other organ shall possess only a temporary veto power over other legislative measures;

b. That the prime minister and the ministers of state, all of whom shall be civilians and of whom a majority, including the prime minister, shall be selected from the Diet, shall form a Cabinet collectively responsible to the legislature. If a system of government is adopted whereby the chief executive is elected to that office by the people, the provision that a majority of the Cabinet members

shall be chosen from the legislature should not necessarily apply;

c. That the legislative organ shall have the power to meet at will.

4. If the Japanese decide to retain the Institution of the Emperor, the following safeguards in addition to those enumerated in 1 and 3 above will be necessary:

a. When a Cabinet loses the confidence of the legislature it shall either resign or appeal to the electorate;

b. The Emperor shall have no powers other than those to be conferred on him by the new Constitution. He shall act in all cases in accordance with the advice of the Cabinet;

c. The Emperor shall be deprived of all military authority such as that provided in articles XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of chapter 1 of the Constitution of 1889;

d. All property of the Imperial household shall be declared property of the State. The expenses of the Imperial household shall be appropriated by the legislature.

5. The retention of the Privy Council and the House of Peers in their present form and with their present powers is not considered consistent with the foregoing general objectives.

Further Policies Relating to New Japanese Constitution³

The Far Eastern Commission reaffirms its previous decision, taken in FEC-031/19, Basic Principles for a New Japanese Constitution, that all cabinet ministers should be civilians, and further decides as a matter of policy that the House of Councillors should not have any predominance over the House of Representatives. The Commission considers essential its continuing right to scrutinize the implementing legislation very carefully to insure that such predominance is not established.

³ Policy decision approved by the Far Eastern Commission on Sept. 25, 1946, and released to the press on Apr. 18, 1947. A directive based upon this decision was forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for implementation.

Review of Japanese Constitution⁴

a. The terms of the policy decision contained in FEC-031/4 (Provisions for the Review of a New Japanese Constitution, approved on October 17, 1946, and forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers on October 28, 1946, Serial #62) should be formally communicated to the Government of Japan.⁵

b. The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers should be informed that the time and manner of public announcement of this policy decision are still being considered by the Far Eastern Commission.

Apprehension, Trial, and Punishment of War Criminals in the Far East⁶

1. The term "war crimes" as used herein, includes:

a. Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements and assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing.

b. Violations of the laws or customs of war. Such violations shall include but not be limited to murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of, or in, occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, or elsewhere improper treatment of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages or devastation not justified by military necessity.

c. Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war or prosecution on political, racial or religious grounds in execution of or in connection with any

⁴ Policy decision approved by the Far Eastern Commission on Dec. 12, 1946, and released to the press on Apr. 18, 1947. A directive based upon this decision was forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for implementation.

⁵ BULLETIN of Apr. 6, 1947, p. 612.

⁶ Policy decision approved by the Far Eastern Commission on Apr. 3, 1946, and released to the press on Apr. 18, 1947. A directive based upon this decision was forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for implementation.

crime defined herein whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated.

2. The offense need not have been committed after a particular date to render the responsible party or parties subject to arrest but, in general, should have been committed since, or in the period immediately preceding the Mukden incident of September 18, 1931. The preponderance of cases may be expected to relate to the years since the Lukouchiao incident of July 7, 1937.

3. All practicable measures should be taken to identify, investigate, apprehend, and detain all persons suspected of having committed war crimes, as defined in paragraph 1 above, and all persons whom any one of the United Nations or Italy charges with such crimes.

4. Suspected war criminals should be held in close confinement, without access to the press or other media of public information, and without distinction as to rank or position, as befits ordinary criminals.

5. The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers should have:

(a) Power to appoint special international military courts (which term should be held to include tribunals of any type) composed of military, naval, or air force officers or civilians representing any two or more of the states members of the Far Eastern Commission for the trial under any applicable law, domestic or international, including the laws and customs of war, of the Far Eastern war criminals indicted by the Governments of these states, and

(b) Power to prescribe, subject to consultation with the representatives of those governments, rules of procedure for such courts, the Supreme Commander shall appoint to each international court a judge nominated by each state represented on the Far Eastern Commission which signifies its desire to participate in the work of such court. In the appointment of the international courts and in all trials before them, the international character of the courts and of the authority by which they were appointed and under which they act should be properly emphasized and recognized, particularly in dealings with the Japanese people. The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers should have: (1) the responsibility for carrying out the judgments of any international courts appointed

by him, and (2) the power to approve, reduce or otherwise alter any sentences imposed by any such courts, but not to increase the severity thereof, after consultation with the Allied Council for Japan and the Representatives in Japan of the other Powers, members of the Far Eastern Commission.

6. The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (a) should promptly establish an agency, acting under his command to investigate reports of war crimes, to collect and analyze evidence, to arrange for the apprehension and prompt trial of suspects, to prepare, supervise and conduct the prosecution of individuals and organizations before international military courts or tribunals, and to recommend to the Supreme Commander which individuals and organizations should be prosecuted, before what courts they should be tried and what persons should be secured as witnesses, and (b) should provide, after discussion with the local representatives of the nations involved, and in a manner consistent with efficient administration, for equitable inclusion in the membership of such agency of suitable representatives of the states members of the Far Eastern Commission. This agency should advise the Supreme Commander and other military commanders for the Allies on matters relating to war criminals. This agency should attach importance to the investigation of the evidence that offenses of the type described in paragraph 1 a above have been committed, should collect and analyze the evidence of such offenses and should recommend to the Supreme Commander a plan as indicated in paragraph 5 above for the appointment of an international court for the trial of such offenses and the charges to be preferred. This agency should also maintain a central record and information office of Japanese war criminals and war crimes, the records and files of which should be available to any interested United Nation.

7. The military commander of any nation (including the United States) participating in the occupation of areas previously dominated by Japan may establish special national military courts to deal with war criminals not held or requested by the Supreme Commander for trial by an international military court or tribunal of the types referred to in paragraph 6 above. Such courts should be separate from courts which may be set

up to deal with current offenses against the occupation or infractions of military discipline.

8. Military commanders of forces of occupation in the Far East should promptly comply with a request by the government of any one of the United Nations or Italy for the delivery to it of any person who is stated in such request to be charged with a war crime subject to the following exceptions:

(1) Persons who have held high political, civil or military positions in the Japanese Empire or in one of its allies, co-belligerents or satellites, should not be delivered, pending decision whether such person should be tried before an international military court or tribunal. Suspected war criminals desired for trial before such a court or tribunal or persons desired as witnesses at such trials will not be turned over to the nation requesting them so long as their presence is desired in connection with such trials.

(2) Where persons are requested by more than one of the Governments above mentioned for trial of a war crime, the military commanders concerned should make their determinations based on all the circumstances, including the relative seriousness of the respective charges against such a person and the national interests involved, and should deliver the requested person to a particular United Nation or Italy accordingly.

9. Compliance with any request for the delivery of a suspected war criminal should not be delayed on the ground that other requests for the same person are anticipated.

10. Delivery of a suspected war criminal to a requesting government should be subject to the condition that if such person is not brought to trial, tried and convicted within six months from the date he is so delivered, he will be returned to the authority who made delivery if he has been requested for trial by any of the other United Nations or Italy.

11. Military commanders should take under their control, pending subsequent decisions as to its eventual disposition, property, real and personal, found in areas of their respective jurisdiction and owned or controlled by persons taken into custody pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 3 above.

12. Such measures as are deemed necessary should be taken to insure that witnesses to war crimes will be available when required.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

13. The execution of death sentences should be deferred if there is a reason to believe that the testimony of those convicted would be of value in the trial of other war criminals.

14. Any national of any United Nation who may be requested, or who there is reason to believe may be desired, by his government as a renegade or quisling, should be arrested. Such persons should normally be turned over as soon as practicable to their government.

15. Military commanders having custody of alleged offenders requested under paragraphs 8 and 14 above, if in doubt as to whether such persons should be turned over to the demanding nation for trial, should consult their government and, in appropriate cases leave the matter to be dealt with through diplomatic channels. Within the main islands of Japan, the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers will have custody of such alleged offenders and should consult the Joint Chiefs of Staff in cases of doubt.

Determination of Peaceful Needs of Japan¹

1. The Far Eastern Commission determines as a matter of policy that the peaceful needs of the Japanese people should be defined as being substantially the standard of living prevailing in Japan during the period of 1930-1934.

2. Data about the standard of living during 1930-1934 should for present purposes be used to make an estimate of Japan's peaceful needs in 1950. In estimating the nature and size of the industrial structure within that level, account should be taken of such factors as technological developments, the balance of payments, and employment.

3. Acceptance of the above policy should not be interpreted to mean acceptance in advance of a specific level for any particular industry.

¹ Policy decision approved by the Far Eastern Commission on Jan. 23, 1947, and released to the press on Apr. 18. A directive based upon this decision was forwarded to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for implementation.

U.S. DELEGATION TO ILO INDUSTRIAL COMMITTEE ON COAL MINING

[Released to the press April 25]

The President has approved the composition of the United States Delegation to the second meeting of the Industrial Committee on Coal Mining of the International Labor Organization, as submitted by the Secretary of State upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Labor. The meeting will commence on April 24 at Geneva, Switzerland, and will continue for 10 days.

The United States Delegation is a tripartite group of six delegates representing equally, in accordance with ILO constitutional provisions, government, management, and labor. In addition, two Government advisers will participate. The Delegation is listed as follows:

Representing the Government of the United States:

Delegates

Harry Weiss, Director, Economics Branch, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Department of Labor

Louis C. McCabe, Chief of the Coal Division of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior

Advisers

Witt Bowden, Economist, Labor Economics Staff, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor

Paul R. Porter, Acting Chief, Mission for Economic Affairs, London

Representing the Employers of the United States

Robert P. Koenig, President, Ayrshire Collieries Corporation, Indianapolis, Indiana

H. J. Connolly, President, Pennsylvania Coal Company, Scranton, Pennsylvania

The following members originally scheduled to represent the workers of the United States have been detained by Union business:

Thomas Kennedy, Secretary-Treasurer, United Mine Workers of America, Washington, D. C.

John T. Jones, President, District 16, United Mine Workers of America, Washington, D. C.

This will be the second session of the Coal Mining Committee, the first having been held in December 1945 at London. The meeting stems from the policy inaugurated by the Governing Body of the International Labor Office in January 1945 of establishing seven major industrial committees for the purpose of paying closer attention to the individual industries, and thus implementing the previously evolved general principles governing

25]
of
meet-
ing
sub-
com-
meet-
vit-
ite
in
ons,
on,
The
and
ment
the
reau
omic
rpo-
any,
l to
ave
line
ork-
In-
De-
rom
y of
5 for
ndi-
the
ing
elin

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

labor standards and social policy on an individual industry basis.

The 12 major coal-producing countries that comprise the Committee are Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, the Netherlands, Poland, the Union of South Africa, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The agenda for the second session will include a report on the progress made by the member countries since the first meeting. The mineworkers' charter, which was drafted at the first session, will be scrutinized in the light of subsequent developments, particularly with respect to mine-safety provisions. Attention will also be focused upon the utilization of the economic, human, and technical resources of the coal mining industry in view of the critical need for increased production of fuel in Europe at this time.

In accordance with the terms of the agreement between the International Labor Organization and the United Nations, representatives of interested agencies of the United Nations have been invited to attend the meeting.

U. S. DELEGATION TO IMMRA

[Released to the press April 24]

The Acting Secretary of State announced on April 24 that the President has approved the composition of the American Delegation to the International Meeting on Marine Radio Aids to Navigation (IMMRAN), which is scheduled to be held at New York, N. Y., and New London, Conn., beginning on April 28, 1947, and continuing for two weeks. The nominations were submitted by Acting Secretary Acheson upon the recommendation of the interested Government agencies, the National Federation of American Shipping, and the Radio Manufacturers Association.

The American Delegation is as follows:

Chairman

John S. Cross, Assistant Chief, Telecommunications Division, Department of State

Vice Chairman

Edward M. Webster, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission

Delegates

Capt. H. C. Moore, United States Coast Guard

Commodore Gordon McLintock, United States Maritime Commission

Lt. Comdr. Irvin L. McNally, United States Navy

Daniel J. McKenzie, Master Mariner, Transportation Corps, War Department
Lt. Comdr. Clarence A. Burmister, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce
P. De Forrest McKeel, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce
Edward C. Phillips, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., Washington
W. R. G. Baker, Radio Manufacturers Association, Washington

The purpose of the meeting is to provide information to foreign countries regarding United States policy in the field of marine radio aids to navigation and to demonstrate the progress which the United States has made in this field. The sessions in New York will consist of lectures and discussions, and exhibits by manufacturers of radio and electronic equipment, including radar and loran. During the second week the headquarters of the meeting will be at the United States Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn., where there will be further discussions and demonstrations at sea of equipment under operating conditions. Vessels for the demonstrations on shipboard have been made available by the United States Maritime Commission, the United States Coast Guard, and the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

It is expected that the meeting will inform the delegates regarding the adoption of new radio aids to navigation by this Government and the availability, type, and quality of marine radio-aid equipment produced by United States manufacturers. Should it appear that fruitful conclusions and resolutions leading to world standardization of marine radio aids can be evolved during the progress of the meeting, such conclusions and resolutions will be recorded for future reference and utilization when the nations of the world meet to consider standardization of equipment in this field.

The Honorary Chairman of the meeting will be Garrison Norton, Assistant Secretary of State. Chairman of the meeting will be William L. Everitt of the University of Illinois. John S. Cross of the Department of State will serve as Executive Secretary and Lt. Comdr. L. E. Brunner of the United States Coast Guard as Program Coordinator. Henry F. Nichol and Reginald T. Johnson, both of the Department of State, will serve respectively as the Executive Officer and the Administrative Officer of the meeting.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

The congressional advisers who are expected to attend are: Fred Bradley of Michigan; Alvin F. Weichel of Ohio; T. Millet Hand of New Jersey; Henry J. Latham of New York; David M. Potts of New York; Willis W. Bradley of California; Thor C. Tollefson of Washington; Horace Seely-Brown of Connecticut; John C. Brophy of Wisconsin; Robert Nodar, Jr., of New York; Herbert C. Bonner of North Carolina; Henry M. Jackson of Washington; Eugene J. Keogh of New York; Cecil R. King of California; Emory H. Price of Florida; and Leo F. Rayfiel of New York. Accompanying them will be Marvin Coles, Chief Counsel, and Guy H. La Bounty, Chief Investigator, both of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, House of Representatives.

Attached to the Delegation will be approximately 15 industry advisers and 20 advisers from United States Government agencies. In addition, speakers who are experts in the field of radio and radio marine aids to navigation will address the meeting.

To date 26 countries have accepted the invitation to IMMRAN. The United Kingdom Delegation will be headed by Sir Watson-Watt, well-known scientist in the field of electronics.

U.S. DELEGATION TO FIRST ASSEMBLY OF ICAO

[Released to the press April 23]

The President announced on April 23 the composition of the United States Delegation to the first assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization, scheduled to convene in Montreal, Canada, May 6, 1947.

The Delegation will be headed by Garrison Norton, Assistant Secretary of State and chairman of the Air Coordinating Committee. William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and vice chairman of the Committee, will be alternate chairman. Other delegates designated by the President are: James M. Landis, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and co-chairman of the Committee; Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, U.S. Representative to the ICAO Council; Harllee Branch, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; L. Welch Pogue, president of National Aeronautic Association and member of the Industry Advisory Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee; and Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith, U.S. Representative to the Air Navigation Committee and an alternate to General Kuter on the ICAO Council.

Invitations have been extended to both Houses of Congress to send congressional advisers as part of the Delegation.

Designated as consultants to the Delegation were: W. Stuart Symington, Assistant Secretary of War for Air; John N. Brown, Assistant Secretary of Navy for Air; Robert S. Burgess, Deputy Second Assistant Postmaster General; Gerald Brophy, former U.S. Representative to PICAO.

The President named the following as alternate delegates: Russell B. Adams, Director, Economic Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Board; J. Paul Barringer, Assistant Chief, Aviation Division, Department of State; Paul T. David, U.S. Representative on Air Transport Committee and an alternate to General Kuter on ICAO Council; Livingston T. Merchant, Chief, Aviation Division, Department of State; Emery Nunneley, General Counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board; Carl Schwartz, Assistant Chief, Estimates Division, Bureau of the Budget; Charles I. Stanton, Deputy Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce.

Included on the Delegation as advisers are the following Government and industry aviation experts: Col. W. G. Bryte, Chief, Civil Air Division AC/AS5, War Department; G. N. Calkins, Attorney Adviser, General Counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board; Enar B. Olson, Budget Analyst, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce; Glen Gilbert, Chief, Technical Mission, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce; Frank Hefner, Budget Examiner, Bureau of the Budget; Robert Hoyt, Coordinator of International Relations, Civil Aeronautics Board; Stephen Latchford, Aviation Adviser, Aviation Division, Department of State; Comdr. E. S. Lee, Jr., Civil Aviation Section, Naval Operations, Navy Department; Robert J. G. McClurkin, Assistant Director, Economic Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Board; Walker Percy, CAA-PICAO Coordinator, Department of Commerce; David W. Wainhouse, Assistant Chief, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State; Richard K. Waldo, Special Assistant on ICAO Matters, Aviation Division, Department of State; John Dickerman, Air Line Pilots Association; Donald W. Nyrop, Air Transport Association; Stuart Tipton, Air Transport Association; W. K. Ebel, vice president, Glenn L. Martin Company, and member of Aircraft Industries Associa-

tion; Hall L. Hibbard, vice president, Lockheed Corporation, and member of Aircraft Industries Association. Representatives of United States flag airlines engaged in international air commerce have been invited to attend the assembly session as observers attached to the United States Delegation.

United States positions on specific agenda items are in the process of preparation within the framework of the Air Coordinating Committee, providing an opportunity for full and complete industry participation in the development of United States positions. The provisional agenda for the Assembly has been in the hands of the Air Coordinating Committee since March 6, 1947.

The assembly at Montreal will be of particular importance this year in as much as this will be the first assembly of the permanent organization. The convention on international civil aviation, drafted at the Chicago aviation conference in the winter of 1944, under which the permanent organization was established, came into force on April 4, 1947, following receipt of the necessary number of ratifications from member governments.

Among the items to be considered at the assembly are the organization, structure, and duties of the permanent international body, the relationship of the organization to the United Nations, the financing of ground facilities on an international basis and a possible multilateral air-transport convention.

The Twelfth Pan American Sanitary Conference: Regional Health Programs and World Health Organization

The Twelfth Pan American Sanitary Conference met in Caracas, Venezuela, from January 12 to 24, 1947. It was composed of delegates from 20 of the 21 American republics,¹ together with observers² from Canada and the British, Dutch, and French territorial possessions in the Western Hemisphere, and from the World Health Organization, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and Pan American Airways.

The agenda of the Conference included a wide range of health problems which may be grouped under three major categories: (1) those concerning international cooperation and organization in public health; (2) those relating to national policies and organization in public health; and (3) those regarding the prevention and eradication of major diseases. Although the work of the Conference in the last two fields was of vital significance since it affects the health of all the peoples of the Western Hemisphere, the Conference decisions in the field of international public-health organization have aroused such wide-spread interest that they will be given primary attention in the present article.

The most controversial issue facing the Conference was that of the relationship between the Pan American Sanitary Bureau and the World Health Organization. The constitution of the World Health Organization, as drawn up and signed by

the representatives of 61 nations at the International Health Conference in New York City on July 22, 1946, provides in chapter XI for the structure of regional offices and committees of the World Health Organization and in article 54 states that:

"The Pan American sanitary organization represented by the Pan American Sanitary Bureau and the Pan American Sanitary Conferences, and all other inter-governmental regional health organizations in existence prior to the date of signature of this Constitution, shall in due course be integrated with the Organization. This integration shall be effected as soon as practicable through common action based on mutual consent of the competent authorities expressed through the organizations concerned."

A subcommittee of representatives of four American republics (Brazil, Mexico, United States, and Venezuela) was appointed by the In-

¹ The Dominican Republic received an invitation from the Venezuelan Government, transmitted through the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, but declined to send representatives.

² It was decided by the Conference that representatives of states and territories not members of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau would have full right of participation in the discussions and work of the Conference, but without the right to vote.

ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPMENTS

terim Commission of the World Health Organization to negotiate with the Pan American sanitary organization in order to implement this article. This subcommittee prepared in the fall of 1946 a draft agreement between the two organizations. The Directing Council of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau met in early October and approved a document called the "Declaration of Habana" which urged that the American republics in ratifying the constitution of the World Health Organization seek assistance to insure that the complete organizational, financial, administrative, and policy independence of the Bureau would be preserved in any agreement with the World Health Organization.

Four principal issues faced the commission of the Conference which dealt with this problem: (a) the general nature and form of action which the Conference should take; (b) the policy to be recommended as to approval of the constitution of the World Health Organization; (c) whether, after integration, the Pan American sanitary organization would continue to carry on activities apart from those as regional agency of the World Health Organization; and (d) the extent to which the Pan American sanitary organization would be required to conform to the World Health Organization constitution and policies, both in serving as its regional organization and in any separate activities.

1. As to the nature of the action to be taken by the Conference, there was an initial difference of opinion as to whether the Conference should seek to work out the terms of an agreement with the World Health Organization or should confine itself to a brief statement of general principles to govern the relations.

It was therefore agreed to adopt a generally worded resolution and to place the more detailed provisions in an annex as the guiding basis for the formulation of a specific agreement with the World Health Organization. In this resolution the Conference authorizes the Directing Council of the Bureau to negotiate the agreement within the framework of the principles set forth in the annex and specifically delegates to the Council power to approve modifications therein if this proves desirable. A motion to limit this power to acceptance only of proposals falling within the context of the points in the annex was defeated in the full commission (receiving only three votes) when the

desirability was pointed out of giving the Council certain freedom of action in negotiating the agreement.

The procedure thus worked out is believed to be eminently practicable. It permits prompt negotiations with the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization for the formulation of the specific agreement and fulfills the requirement in article 54 of the World Health Organization constitution that the "mutual consent of the competent authorities" to proceed with integration should be "expressed through the organizations concerned". Yet the procedure obviates the necessity of further reference of a specific agreement to the individual American governments and avoids the four-year delay which would have occurred if the agreement had been required to be submitted to the next Pan American Sanitary Conference for approval. Once negotiated, the agreement is to come into effect, according to paragraph VI of the resolution, after the establishment of the World Health Organization, approval by the World Health Assembly, ratification of the constitution by 14 American republics, and signature of the agreement by the Director of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau.

2. The second major problem mentioned above related to the policy to be recommended by the Conference on ratification of the World Health Organization constitution. The United States position at the Conference was one of firm opposition to any recommendation to the governments to ratify the constitution with reservations. The resolution as finally agreed upon recommends the prompt approval of the constitution by all American republics with no reference to reservations of any kind.

3. The third question was whether, after the agreement with the World Health Organization became effective, the Pan American Sanitary Bureau would continue any separate activities in addition to its functions as regional office. The possibility of additional activities was envisaged in the draft agreement prepared by the subcommittee of the World Health Organization, and it was generally assumed in the discussions at the Conference that separate activities would be continued by the Bureau. Indeed, the list of principles in the annex to the resolution places great emphasis upon such separate programs.

4. The basic issue of the extent to which the Pan American Sanitary Bureau should conform to the World Health Organization constitution and policies, both in serving as regional office and in its separate activities, was not definitely settled in all its aspects.

However, a key to the resolution of this problem is found in paragraph 1 of the annex:

"The Pan American Sanitary Organization . . . shall continue to function in its continental character in American aspects of health problems and shall act as Regional Committee and Office of the World Health Organization in the Western Hemisphere, in accordance with the Constitution of the World Health Organization."

This clearly provides for conformance with the World Health Organization constitution when the Organization acts as regional agency. However, there was no discussion as to whether the final phrase following the comma applies to the entire paragraph or only the last portion.

Nevertheless, two other articles in the annex establish a pattern of conformance of the Bureau, even in its separate activities, to World Health Organization constitution and policies. Article IX provides that the Pan American Sanitary Conference—

"is free to promote and adopt sanitary standards and conventions in the Western Hemisphere being required to take into account and to proceed in accordance with the standards, conventions and plans of the World Health Organization . . .".

Article X empowers the Bureau to undertake regional health programs under the terms of the Pan American Sanitary Code and as directed by the conferences or the Directing Council, "provided that such programs are not incompatible with the Constitution of the World Health Organization".

The provisions concerning the election of the Director were considered as of the greatest importance, since the post is a dual one under the

present concept. The idea was readily accepted that the existing Director at the time the agreement becomes effective shall assume the post of Regional Director until the end of his term. After discussion it was agreed that his successors should be elected by the Executive Board of the World Health Organization in agreement with the Pan American Sanitary Conference (as provided in article 52 of the World Health Organization constitution) with two conditions: (1) that the person must have received the vote of two-thirds of the American republics in the Directing Council, and (2) that both the Directing Council and the World Health Organization may reject candidates proposed by the other only once for each election. The United States Delegation did not favor the latter condition.

The complex of problems with which the Conference dealt in the field of national policies and organization of public health included the National Organization of Sanitary Services, the relations between social security and public-health service, post-war health problems with special reference to migration, and the regulation of food and drugs. An equally important portion of the Conference agenda was devoted to problems of the diagnosis, control, and treatment of diseases which constitute nation-wide problems, such as malaria, tuberculosis, and venereal disease, as well as rabies, typhus, plague, and other animal diseases transmittable to man.

Each of these topics was assigned to a special commission of the Conference attended by representatives who were experts in these particular fields and, through discussion and a sharing of experiences among these leaders in public health, a series of resolutions and recommendations was evolved on each of the subjects. After consideration and approval by the full Conference, these were transmitted to the governments. It will be part of the continuing task of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau to work with the 21 American governments to seek to assure the implementation of these programs.

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Soviet Position on Reconvening of Joint U. S.-U. S. S. R. Commission

NOTE FROM SOVIET MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

DEAR MR. MARSHALL:

In reply to your letter of April 8 on the question of Korea,¹ I am communicating the following:

At the Moscow meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, the United States of America and the United Kingdom in December 1945, an agreement was reached which determined the policy of the three powers with respect to Korea. A basis for this agreement were the proposals of the Soviet Government, to which the Government of the U.S.A. also agreed, having consequently abandoned its first intention not to establish a National Korean Government in Korea. The Moscow Agreement held the establishment of a provisional democratic Korean Government which could take all the necessary measures for the development of Korean industry, transport, agriculture and the national culture of the Korean people, to be a problem of primary importance.

Having made these proposals, the Soviet Government deemed that the unification of Korea under the leadership of the Korean National Government was the most important prerequisite for the restoration of Korea as an independent state and the establishment of bases for the development of the country on democratic principles.

The Soviet Government continues to adhere to this point of view and insists on a steadfast implementation of the Moscow Agreement on Korea, being certain that, on the basis of the execution of this agreement Korea would be successfully developed along democratic principles and would become an independent and prosperous state and an equal member of the United Nations.

However, the legislative program provided for Korea by the Moscow Agreement has not yet been carried out. A provisional democratic Korean Government has not been established. The work of the Joint Soviet-American Commission, estab-

lished for the purpose of collaborating in the establishment of a provisional democratic Korean Government was suspended as a result of the fact that the American delegation on this Commission took a stand contrary to the Moscow Agreement on Korea. Furthermore, the American Command in southern Korea did not agree to a serious consideration of the proposals by the Soviet Command in northern Korea on the question of an economic exchange between the two zones, which made it impossible to reach an agreement on this question.

In the course of the work of the Joint Soviet-American Commission during the period from March to May, 1946, the Soviet delegation made every effort to effect the execution of the aforementioned agreement on Korea and, first of all, provide for a prompt establishment of a provisional democratic Korean Government and for the unification of Korea under its leadership. However, the Soviet delegation met not only with difficulties in this connection, but also with direct counter-action on the part of the American delegation. Basing itself on the agreement on Korea which provides that the Joint Commission, in formulating its proposals, should consult Korean democratic parties and social organizations, the Soviet delegation insisted on a wide-scale attraction of such parties and organizations to consultation with the Commission. The American delegation excluded participation by a whole series of large democratic organizations in southern Korea and insisted on consultation with groups which had taken a stand in opposition to the Moscow Agreement, consultation with which, naturally could not facilitate the execution of this agreement. The American delegation included in the list of parties and organizations submitted by it for consultation with the Joint Commission, seventeen political parties and social groups of southern Korea which took a stand against the

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 20, 1947, p. 716.

Moscow Agreement, and only three democratic parties which supported the agreement. The American delegation excluded such large democratic parties and social organizations as the All-Korean Labor Confederation, the All-Korean Peasant Union, the Korean National Revolutionary Party, the All-Korean Youth Union, etc., from participation in consultation. Deeming it impossible to agree to this position of the American delegation, the Soviet delegation nevertheless did its utmost to find a way to reach an agreed decision. This, however, appeared impossible and the work of the Commission, on the suggestion of the American delegation, was curtailed.

The intolerance of the resulting situation is evident. As a result of this, as you know, it was necessary to take new measures in endeavoring to find a way out of such a situation.

The Soviet Commander in his relations with the American Commander endeavored to find a basis for the renewal of the work of the Joint Commission. As a result of an exchange of letters, there has been a considerable *rapprochement* of the points of view of both sides, which fact was noted by both commanders. It was expected that an agreement would soon be reached and the Joint Commission would begin its work very shortly. However, no reply has been received to date from the American Commander to the last letter of February 28, from the Soviet Commander and the proposed agreement was not reached. Disagreement of action was a serious obstacle for the opportune fulfillment of the program of measures proposed in the Moscow Agreement of Korea as a whole.

In connection with northern Korea, during the period beginning with the capitulation of Japan, considerable progress was made in the field of democratization, and also with respect to the restoration of national economy and culture. Wide democratic reforms have been made which guarantee political freedom and raise the standard of living of the population. I have in mind, first of all, the introduction of an over-all electoral right; a law on equal rights for women; the establishment of local authority agencies and the People's Committee of Northern Korea on the basis of free democratic elections; land reform, as a result of which 725,000 landless peasant farmers and those having little land received more than 1 million hectares of free land, which formerly be-

longed to Japanese colonists and their accomplices in Korea; the nationalization of former Japanese industries, the 8 hour work-day, safeguarding of labor and social insurance; public educational reform, as a result of which the Korean language has been reestablished, the network of schools was increased and the number of students was increased, etc. However, such wide democratic reforms have been carried out only in northern Korea, where there is only two fifths of the population of Korea.

The Soviet Government, closely adhering in their policy toward Korea to the program planned in the Moscow Agreement, believes the following to be points of primary importance:

1. The establishment of a provisional democratic Korean Government on the basis of a wide-scale participation of Korean democratic parties and social organizations, in order to expedite the political and economic unification of Korea as a self-supporting state independent of foreign interference, which would do away with the division of the country into two zones.

2. The establishment of democratic authority agencies throughout Korea by means of free elections on the basis of a general and equal electoral right.

3. The aiding of Korean people in the restoration of Korea as an independent democratic state and in the development of its national economy and national culture.

In conformity with the steadfast aspiration on the part of the Soviet Government for the prompt restoration of Korea as a united sovereign state and elimination of difficulties arising from the fact that Korea to date has not been unified and does not have a national government, I propose that the Joint Soviet-American Commission resume its work on May 20 of the current year in the city of Seoul, on the basis of an exact execution of the Moscow Agreement on Korea, and that the Commission present the result of its work on the elaboration of recommendations with respect to the establishment of a provisional democratic Korean Government for consideration by the two governments in July and August 1947.

I am sending copies of the present letter to Mr. Bevin and to the Chinese Ambassador in Moscow.

I beg you [etc.]

V. MOLOTOV

Lend-Lease to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics¹

Lend-Lease Assistance to the Soviet Union During the Period of Hostilities

Lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union during the period of hostilities amounting to about \$11,100,000,000 was rendered under the terms of a master lend-lease agreement with the Soviet Government signed on June 11, 1942. Aid on this basis was ordered halted on V-J Day, September 2, 1945, and no further shipments were made except for goods then in process of loading or in transit to shipside. Aid rendered from V-E Day, May 12, 1945, to V-J Day, September 2, 1945, was solely for support of the Soviet Far Eastern Army and the strengthening of this area for operations against Japan. Ninety-five merchant ships now remain in Soviet possession out of the 126 which were transferred under the terms of the master agreement of June 11, 1942. The Soviet Government has now agreed to commence discussions for settlement of its obligations for lend-lease aid rendered under this agreement. These discussions will include the disposition of the 95 merchant ships.

Lend-Lease Shipments to the Soviet Union Since V-J Day

On V-J Day, September 2, 1945, there remained in warehouses and in production, quantities of lend-lease articles which had been ordered for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics during the period of hostilities. These articles were the residue of a larger quantity of orders, many of which were cancelled shortly after the cessation of hostilities in Europe on V-E Day, May 12, 1945. On October 15, 1945, an agreement was concluded with the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics under section 3(c) of the Lend-Lease Act which reads in part as follows:

" . . . until July 1, 1949, any of such powers may be exercised to the extent necessary to carry out a contract or agreement with such a foreign government made before July 1, 1946"

The agreement of October 15, 1945, was con-

¹ Statement prepared by the Department of State and presented to the Senate on Apr. 18 by Arthur H. Vandenberg, President *pro tempore* of the Senate.

cluded independently of the master lend-lease agreement of June 11, 1942. Under its terms the Government of the United States agreed to deliver and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agreed to accept under terms of payment stated below a specific quantity of these residual supplies. The supplies included in the schedules of this agreement consist primarily of industrial and transportation equipment fabricated to Soviet specifications. (No arms, ammunition, or implements of war were included for shipment under the agreement of October 15, 1945. It will also be noted from the tables below that no cargo trucks were included in the "pipeline" schedule.) As a whole this equipment would have brought a limited return if disposed of in the United States as surplus. In many instances contract-cancellation charges for material still in production on V-J Day would have been excessive. Up to December 31, 1946, materials valued at \$233,000,000 had been transferred to the Soviet Government under this agreement and only about \$17,000,000 of equipment still remained untransferred either located at warehouses or in production. All transfers are now suspended pending consideration by the Congress.

The articles shipped after V-J Day and up to December 31, 1946, were as follows:

Machine tools	\$40,850,000
Steam locomotives (Russian gage)	30,634,000
Generator sets	22,800,000
Cranes, derricks, hoists, etc.	8,129,000
Electric rotating equipment	8,633,000
Marine engines	6,824,000
Canned tushonka	4,054,000
Pumps	4,620,000
Crushing equipment	4,135,000
Valves and fittings	5,114,000
Gas-producing equipment	4,177,000
Secondary metal-forming machinery	4,956,000
Diesel electric locomotives (Russian gage)	3,001,000
Industrial trucks and tractors	3,768,000
Fan and blower equipment	3,182,000
Power-transmission equipment	3,162,000
Power-conversion equipment	3,117,000
Rolling mills and equipment	3,372,000
Mine and quarry machinery	3,600,000
Insulated wire and cable	3,765,000
Bearings	2,893,000

Metal-melting and heating furnaces	\$2,079,000
Welding machinery	2,965,000
Metal-cutting tools	2,289,000
Mine-type locomotives	2,085,000
Leather	2,117,000
Various industrial equipment and materials	46,589,000

Total	\$233,000,000
-------	---------------

The equipment remaining to be transferred to the Soviet Government under the agreement is made up as follows:

Oil-refinery equipment

Equipment to expand refineries shipped to the U.S.S.R. before the cessation of hostilities 9/2/45	\$6,972,000
---	-------------

Mine hoists	\$3,058,000
Locomotive storage batteries	1,777,000
Power equipment	1,272,000
Electrical equipment	945,000
Mining equipment	674,000
Electric motors and controllers	350,000
Miscellaneous machinery and equipment	1,648,000

Total	\$16,696,000
-------	--------------

Payment for articles covered by the "pipeline" agreement as set forth above is to be made over a period of 30 years ending in 1975, with interest at 2½ percent per annum. The first payment of interest will be due July 1, 1947. The first payment of principal will be due July 1, 1954.

Protocol on Establishment of Four Power Naval Commission, Disposal of Excess Units of Italian Fleet, and Return by Soviet Union of Warships on Loan

Protocol signed at Paris February 10, 1947, by representatives of the United States, United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and France, on the establishment of a Four Power Naval Commission, the disposal of excess units of the Italian Fleet, and the return by the Soviet Union of warships on loan

PART I

WHEREAS the Treaty of Peace with Italy provides that all the excess units of the Italian Fleet, as listed in Annex XII B of the said Treaty, shall be placed at the disposal of the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and of France;

AND WHEREAS it is necessary to make provision for the final disposal among certain Allied and Associated Powers of the said excess units;

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and of France have therefore agreed as follows:

1. The excess units of the Italian Fleet as listed in Annex XII B of the Treaty of Peace with Italy, and as finally verified on 1st January 1947, shall be allocated as set out in the Annex to this Protocol. No modification of the list of ships in Annex XII B will be accepted, irrespective of the date of any

damage to or loss of such ships, the Italian Government being held responsible for the security and maintenance of such excess units up to the time at which each transfer is completed.

2. Upon transfer by the Italian Government, the vessels concerned shall respectively vest in full ownership in the States hereby becoming entitled thereto, subject to the following exceptions:

- (a) The Governments of the Soviet Union and of France take note: that the Governments of the United Kingdom and of the United States of America have undertaken to meet, at least in part, and out of the tonnage at their disposal, the claims of certain other Powers for Italian naval vessels; furthermore, that in regard to any such Italian naval vessels as the Government of the United States of America may elect to transfer to other Powers, the Government of the United States of America will accept temporary custody only, and, upon transfer of custody by the United States Government to any such Power, full ownership will pass from the Italian Government to that Power.

- (b) None of the Governments concerned shall be obliged to accept any ship assigned to it under this Protocol if such Government deems the ship unsuitable for its purpose, but in that case the Four Powers shall ensure that such ship, unless it is an auxiliary naval vessel, be scrapped or sunk by the Italian Government within nine months from the coming into force of the Treaty.

3. A Commission, to be known as the Four Power Naval Commission, shall be set up, to meet for the first time immediately after the signature both of the Treaty of Peace with Italy and of this Protocol. This Commission shall make all detailed arrangements necessary to effect the transfer of the excess units of the Italian Fleet, together with their spare parts and armament stores, to the beneficiary Powers, in conformity with the naval clauses of the said Treaty.

4. By invitation of the French Government, the Commission will meet in Paris, where it will operate under the authority of the Council of Foreign Ministers, and carry out all preliminary work practicable prior to the coming into force of the Treaty.

5. Upon the coming into force of the Treaty, the Commission will move to Rome, where it will operate under the authority of the Ambassadors of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and France.

6. All orders and instructions by the Commission shall be issued in the name of the four Ambassadors, and shall be communicated by them to the Italian Government for execution.

7. The Commission shall have the right to co-opt the services of representatives of Greece, Yugoslavia and Albania, when matters affecting these States are under discussion, and to call for such Italian representation as may be found necessary to the execution of the work of the Commission.

8. The Annex to this Protocol will be published at a later date.

PART II

AND WHEREAS, by agreement between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, certain warships of the Royal Navy and of the United States Navy were, in 1944, transferred on loan to the Government of the Soviet Union;

AND WHEREAS it is necessary to make provision for the return to the Governments of the United Kingdom and of the United States of America of the aforementioned warships now on loan;

The Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America have further agreed as follows:

9. The representatives of the abovementioned three Governments on the Commission shall coordinate the arrangements for the return to the Governments of the United States of America and of the United Kingdom of the vessels on loan to the Government of the Soviet Union, as listed in paragraph 10 below. The return of such vessels to United Kingdom and United States ports shall, as far as possible, be effected simultaneously with the transfer to the Soviet Union of the excess units of the Italian Fleet allocated to her.

10. List of Vessels on Loan from the United Kingdom

	British Name	Temporary Russian Name
<i>Battleship</i>	Royal Sovereign	Archangelsk
<i>Destroyers</i>	St. Albans	Dostoiny
	Brighton	Zharky
	Richmond	Zhyvuchy
	Chelsea	Derzky
	Leamington	Zhuguchy
	Roxburgh	Doblestny
	Georgetown	Zhostky
<i>Submarines</i>	Unbroken	B. 2
	Unison	B. 3
	Ursula	B. 4

Vessels on Loan from the United States

	United States Name	Temporary Russian Name
<i>Cruiser</i>	Milwaukee	Murmansk

In faith whereof the Undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Protocol, which will take effect immediately, the English, French and Russian texts being equally authentic.

Done in Paris this tenth day of February one thousand nine hundred and forty seven.

[Here follow the signatures.]

THE CONGRESS

Continuing the Authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce To Investigate the Transportation Situation: Report to accompany H. Res. 153. H. Rept. 277, 80th Cong., 1st sess. 1 p.

Reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington: Report to accompany S. 993, a bill to provide for the reincorporation of Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes. S. Rept. 104, 80th Cong., 1st sess. 2 pp.

Correcting an Error in Section 342 (B) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as Amended: Report to accompany H.R. 2237. H. Rept. 272, 80th Cong., 1st sess. 2 pp.

Prot
and
To th
W
sent
with
agre
cotic
23, 19
ruary
Nove
1986.
Th
Succ

The
Th
Th
has t
view
the a
if his
of the
tions
The I
ruary
1931,
Gen
By
Gen
with
sary
funct
ical c
virtue
with
to the
the E
the d

May

ned
co-
the
and
a to
l in
sels
all,
ith
cess
ted

Protocol Amending Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs¹

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the protocol amending the agreements, conventions and protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at The Hague on January 23, 1912, at Geneva on February 11, 1925 and February 19, 1925, and July 13, 1931, at Bangkok on November 27, 1931 and at Geneva on June 26, 1936.

This protocol was opened for signature at Lake Success, New York on December 11, 1946 and was

signed on behalf of the United States of America on that date.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding this protocol.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 22, 1947

(Enclosures: 1. Certified copy of protocol, opened for signature December 11, 1946, amending the agreements, conventions and protocols on narcotic drugs.² 2. Report of the Acting Secretary of State.)

REPORT OF THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE

WASHINGTON, April 21, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of the protocol amending the agreements, conventions and protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at The Hague on January 23, 1912, at Geneva on February 11, 1925 and February 19, 1925, and July 13, 1931, at Bangkok on November 27, 1931 and at Geneva on June 26, 1936.

By resolution adopted February 12, 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations decided, with certain reservations, to take the steps necessary to ensure the uninterrupted exercise of the functions and powers of a technical and non-political character vested in the League of Nations by virtue of international agreements. Questions with respect to those functions and powers relating to the control of narcotic drugs were referred to the Economic and Social Council with a view to the drafting of amendments made necessary as a

result of the dissolution of the League of Nations and the willingness of the United Nations to assume the international control of narcotic drugs. Accordingly, the Economic and Social Council undertook a study of existing international agreements in order to determine how the administrative and enforcement powers conferred by such agreements on the Council of the League of Nations and other bodies could best be transferred to the United Nations without altering the substantive provisions. Subsequently, a draft protocol adopting certain amendments, as set forth in an accompanying annex, was referred to the General Assembly which, on November 19, 1946, unanimously approved the assumption by the United Nations of the functions and powers exercised by the League of Nations in respect of narcotic drugs. The protocol was opened for signature at Lake Success, New York on December 11, 1946 and was signed by the United States Representative to the United Nations on that date.

The six agreements, conventions and protocols, amendment of which is contemplated by the pres-

¹ S. Exec. N, 80th Cong., 1st sess.

² Not printed.

ent protocol, represent the entire field of existing multilateral undertakings of a formal character in regard to narcotic control. They had been drawn up from time to time, as closer collaboration in this field between nations gave reason to expect that they would be accepted by a sufficient number of governments to make further regulation practicable. This explains the existence of six separate international agreements on the subject and the complexity of the control system resulting therefrom. Each of these agreements covers a special aspect of drug control. Each is made effective by its own terms, irrespective of the others, although the 1936 convention does not enumerate the narcotic substances covered by its provisions, merely providing that they are the narcotics referred to in the 1912, 1925, and 1931 conventions.

The Convention for the Suppression of the Abuse of Opium and Other Drugs, signed at The Hague on January 23, 1912, first of the series and antedating the League of Nations, laid the groundwork for drug control by defining raw, prepared, and medicinal opium, morphine, cocaine, and heroin and providing for the adoption of certain measures by the participating Powers for controlling the traffic in those drugs. The United States of America became a contracting party to that convention. The Netherlands Government was designated depositary and remained such until the General Assembly of the League of Nations, by resolution of December 15, 1920, entrusted to the League of Nations, with the consent of the Netherlands Government, the exercise of the powers conferred upon that Government by the Hague Convention. The first Assembly of the League created the Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs to secure the fullest cooperation between the various countries in regard to narcotic control and to assist and advise the Council in matters pertaining thereto.

The Agreement Concerning the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of Prepared Opium, with Protocol, signed at Geneva on February 11, 1925 by representatives of the British Empire (with India), China, France, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Siam, was designed to implement Chapter II of the Hague Convention of 1912. The contracting Powers undertook, with respect to Far Eastern possessions or territories, to make the importation, sale and distribution of opium a monopoly of the Government with a view

to the gradual and effective suppression of the trade in, and use of, prepared opium.

The International Convention Relating to Dangerous Drugs, with Protocol, signed at Geneva on February 19, 1925, further strengthened the Hague Convention of 1912 by extending control to ecgonine and Indian hemp, establishing a system of import certificates and export authorizations, and entrusting supervision over such trade to a Permanent Central Opium Board. The contracting powers were required to furnish this Board estimates of annual drug requirements and statistics showing annual drug production. The United States of America did not become a party to the Geneva Convention of 1925. However, it has cooperated with the Permanent Central Opium Board by making the reports which the Board has requested. Since 1933 it has participated in the nomination of candidates for the Board and in the nomination of a representative to join with the Council in the selection of the Board.

The Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, with Protocol of Signature, signed at Geneva July 13, 1931, advanced the area of control by limiting the world manufacture of narcotic drugs to the world's medical and scientific needs and by limiting in each country the accumulation of stocks of such drugs. In both cases the limitation was to be accomplished by means of a system of government estimates of annual drug requirements, to be examined by an international supervisory body provided for in the convention and to be binding upon the estimating governments. The United States of America was a signatory to this convention and became a party.

The Agreement for the Control of Opium Smoking in the Far East, signed at Bangkok on November 27, 1931, by representatives of the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France, India, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, and Siam, reaffirmed their desire to suppress and discourage opium smoking by providing that the retail sale and distribution of the drug shall take place only from government shops, in the absence of a system of licensing and rationing of smokers. This agreement was applicable only to Far Eastern possessions or territories of the contracting powers, including leased or protected territories in which the use of prepared opium was temporarily authorized.

To
and t
per
for t
gerou
The
consi
tion a
Unit
The
Th
in ne
as or
tions
bodie
tions
as fo
The C
of N
The
the
The
Adv
Tra
Oth
The
Hea
the
tee
nat
liqu
The
ven
bers
shall
amer
Unit
ing t
this
Boar
respo
ary
cons
after
tinu
cont
A
crea

To standardize penalties for illicit trafficking and to formalize arrangements for extradition of persons guilty of drug offenses, the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs was signed at Geneva June 26, 1936. The United States of America participated in the consideration of this convention but the convention as drafted was regarded as unacceptable to the United States of America and was not signed by the American delegates.

The present protocol has the effect of lodging in new administrative and judicial bodies created as organs or under the auspices of the United Nations the authority formerly exercised by various bodies. More particularly the transfer of functions in regard to narcotic control may be shown as follows:

NARCOTIC CONTROL

Functions of	Transferred to
The Council of the League of Nations	The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
The Secretary-General of the League of Nations	The Secretary-General of the United Nations
The League of Nations Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs	The Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
The League of Nations Health Committee and the Permanent Committee of the Office International d'Hygiène publique in Paris	The World Health Organization
The Permanent Court of International Justice	The International Court of Justice

The provisions of the prior agreements, conventions and protocols which refer to states members of the League of Nations and to non-members shall, upon the coming into force of the present amendments, apply to states members of the United Nations and to non-member states. During the period preceding the entry into force of this protocol, the Permanent Central Opium Board and the Supervisory Body established, respectively, by the Geneva conventions of February 19, 1925 and July 13, 1931, shall continue, as constituted, to perform their functions. Thereafter the Board and Supervisory Body will continue to function subject to the amendments contemplated by the present protocol.

A Commission on Narcotic Drugs has been created by the Economic and Social Council of

the United Nations to assist in exercising such authority in respect of narcotic drugs as may be vested in the Council, and particularly to carry out functions formerly entrusted to the League of Nations Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs. Should the amendments relating to the conventions of February 19, 1925 and July 13, 1931 come into force before the World Health Organization is in a position to assume its functions, the functions conferred on that Organization by the amendments shall, provisionally, be performed by its Interim Commission.

The present protocol provides in Article VII that it shall come into force in respect of each party on the date upon which it has been signed on behalf of that party without reservation as to approval, or upon which an instrument of acceptance has been deposited. The amendments set forth in the Annex shall come into force in respect of each agreement, convention and protocol when a majority of the parties thereto have become parties to the present protocol. However, states which are parties to any of the instruments which are to be amended are invited (Article II, paragraph 3) to apply the amended texts of those instruments so soon as the amendments are in force even if they have not yet been able to become parties to the present protocol.

This protocol does not terminate, amend, or add to the substantive provisions in the instruments mentioned above. It is designed solely to transfer functions and responsibilities in the field of narcotic control from the old organisms to new organisms of, or under the auspices of, the United Nations. The substantive commitments of contracting Powers under the several existing instruments remain as before. No additional financial obligation is imposed on the Government of the United States of America and it does not, by this protocol, become a party to any of the existing instruments to which it is not already a party. The provisions in such existing instruments with respect to the procedure for becoming a party thereto and with respect to denunciation are to remain in effect.

It is of the greatest importance to the world that states collaborate in the interest of unbroken control of the traffic in narcotics, so long as danger of drug addiction remains unabated. The danger is

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

greater than ever. Because of the recent war there are many new factories engaged in drug manufacture and processing. A number of countries had been cut off from their normal sources of supply and, to assure for themselves the largely increased requirements which the war necessitated for legitimate medical and scientific operations, they found it necessary to cultivate the raw materials and build factories to convert the raw materials into drugs. The danger is increased by scientific progress. Now the straw of the poppy can be

used for making morphine. A new synthetic drug, demerol (isonipecaine), with properties similar to morphine, is being manufactured in many countries. With new drug sources, increased production, and the susceptibility of war-torn peoples to the taking of drugs to escape suffering, there is a pressing need for further concerted effort to avoid the diversion of dangerous and habit-forming drugs into illicit channels.

Respectfully submitted.

DEAN ACHESON

Report of Operations of the Department of State Under Public Law 584¹

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report, by the Acting Secretary of State, on the operations of the Department of State under section 32 (b) (2) of Public Law 584, Seventy-ninth Congress, as required by that law.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE,

March 10, 1947

(Enclosure: Report from the Acting Secretary of State concerning Public Law 584.)

REPORT OF THE ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE

In accordance with section 32 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended August 1, 1946, the following report is submitted covering operations under paragraph 32 (b) (2) of the act during the period August 1 through December 31, 1946.²

The activities of the Department of State during this period have been confined to the preliminary fiscal and administrative arrangements required for the establishment of a program of international educational exchanges, within the restrictions imposed by the act.

As of December 31, 1946, sales of surplus war property abroad, developing local currencies avail-

able under the act for educational programs, have been made to the following countries: United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Norway, Finland, Netherlands, Belgium, France, Italy, India, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Lebanon, Saudi-Arabia, Ethiopia, China, Netherlands Indies, Philippines, Austria, Korea, and Siam. Sales in process of negotiation may, when consummated, make it possible to develop programs in several other countries.

As of the close of the calendar year 1946 none of the Executive agreements required by the act had been concluded. No American citizens were attending schools or institutions pursuant to such agreements, and no currencies or credits for currencies had been expended for any of the purposes under paragraph 32 (b) (2) of the act.

It is to be expected that during the 1947 calendar year the Executive agreements will be negotiated, and the Board of Foreign Scholarships will be appointed, as provided for in the act. Ample time will then be permitted for the filing of applications for fellowships, in order to give equal opportunity to all those interested. The first fellowships are expected to commence in 1948.

Foreign Commerce Weekly

The following article of interest to BULLETIN readers appeared in the April 19, 1947, issue of *Foreign Commerce Weekly*, a publication of the Department of Commerce, copies of which may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for 15 cents each:

"Malaya Makes Some Progress in Its First Full Year of Peace", by Max Seitelman, Vice Consul, American Consulate General, Singapore.

¹ H. Doc. 167, 80th Cong., 1st sess. Public Law 584 is an act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and to designate the Department of State as the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

² BULLETIN of Aug. 11, 1946, p. 262.

ug,
er to
un-
duc-
s to
is a
void
ing

N

ave
ted
slo-
nd,
ran,
pia,
ria,
ion
de-
e of
had
at-
uch
cur-
oses

cal-
egos-
hips
act.
ing
give
first

ders
Com-
nt of
nting

Full
nsul,

letin

Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy To Transfer Certain Vessels and Material and To Furnish Certain Assistance to the Republic of China¹

WHEREAS the act of July 16, 1946, Public Law 512, Seventy-ninth Congress, provides, in part:

"That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized, whenever in his discretion the public interests render such a course advisable, or will assist in relieving United States forces of duty in China or putting the Government of the Republic of China in better position to protect or improve the safety of navigation in its waters, to provide to the Republic of China such naval services, training, plans, and technical advice as he may deem proper; and to dispose of naval vessels and craft, not to exceed two hundred and seventy-one vessels and craft under authority of this Act, which are in excess of the naval needs of the United States, floating drydocks of capacity sufficient to accommodate any vessel or craft disposed of under authority of this Act, and material necessary for the operation and maintenance of the vessels and craft disposed of under authority of this Act and for the training of the crews of such vessels and craft, to the Republic of China by sale, exchange, lease, gift, or transfer for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty, or upon such other terms and conditions as he may deem proper: *Provided*, That prior to the disposition under the authority of this Act of any battleship, aircraft carrier of any type, cruiser, destroyer (but not destroyer escort), or submarine the President shall first obtain the authority of the Congress in each instance: *Provided further*, That no information, plans, advice, material, documents, blueprints, or other papers, bearing a secret or top-secret classification shall be disposed of or transferred under authority of this Act.

"Sec. 2. The President is authorized, upon application from the Republic of China, and whenever in his discretion the public interests render such a course advisable, to detail not to exceed one hundred officers and two hundred enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to assist the Republic of China in naval matters: *Provided*, That United States naval or Marine Corps personnel shall not accompany Chinese troops, air-

craft, or ships on other than training maneuvers or cruises . . ."

WHEREAS the Republic of China has requested the United States to transfer to it certain specified naval vessels, craft, and floating drydocks, and to furnish it certain technical advice and assistance in connection with the organization and maintenance by it of a naval establishment; and

WHEREAS such vessels and craft are in excess of the naval needs of the United States; and

WHEREAS it appears that the transfer of such vessels, craft, and floating drydocks, and the furnishing of such advice and assistance to the Republic of China would be in accordance with the conditions and limitations of the said act of July 16, 1946, and would be in the public interest:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the said act of July 16, 1946, and as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Subject to the conditions and limitations contained in the said act of July 16, 1946, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized:

(a) To transfer to the Republic of China without compensation the said vessels, craft, and floating drydocks.

(b) To repair, outfit, and equip the vessels, craft, and floating drydocks which are to be transferred under paragraph (a) of this section, and to transfer material deemed by the Secretary of the Navy to be necessary for the operation and maintenance of the vessels and craft so transferred, all on the basis of cash reimbursement of the cost thereof by the Republic of China.

(c) To furnish to the Republic of China such plans, blueprints, documents, and other information in connection with such vessels, craft, and floating drydocks, and such technical information and advice in connection with the organization and maintenance of a naval establishment by the

¹ Ex. Or. 9843 (12 Federal Register 2763).

THE RECORD OF THE WEEK

Republic of China which has not been classified as secret or top-secret as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper.

(d) To train personnel for the operation of such vessels, craft, and floating drydocks, and for such other naval purposes as the Secretary of the Navy may deem proper.

(e) To detail not more than one hundred officers and two hundred enlisted men of the United States Navy or Marine Corps to assist the Republic of China in naval matters under such conditions and subject to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

Section 2. The authority hereby granted shall be exercised by the Secretary of the Navy subject to concurrence by the Secretary of State; and if at any time the Secretary of State shall determine that the transfer of further vessels and craft or material would not be in the public interest, such transfers shall be discontinued.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE
April 25, 1947

U. S. Military Attachés in China Returned by Communist Captors

[Released to the press April 22]

According to recent Chinese Communist broadcasts, Maj. Robert B. Rigg and Capt. John W. Collins, Assistant Military Attachés of the American Embassy at Nanking who were captured by Communist troops on March 1, were released at noon April 24. Following the procedure outlined in the Chinese Communist broadcast, United States representatives were sent to a rendezvous at Hungfangtze, a place northeast of Changchun, to meet Rigg and Collins at the time appointed for their release. The American representatives were Oliver Edmund Clubb, United States Consul General at Harbin, and Lt. Col. Edward T. Cowen, Assistant Military Attaché at the United States Embassy.

Visiting Lecturer of Ceramics to Honduras

James Marek, consultant in ceramics, Indianapolis, Indiana, has been awarded a grant-in-aid by the Department of State to enable him to serve as visiting lecturer of ceramics at the Escuela Nacional de Bellas Artes, Tegucigalpa, Honduras.

Philippine Vice President and Foreign Secretary To Visit U.S.

[Released to the press April 21]

Elpidio Quirino, Vice President and concurrently Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines, has accepted the invitation of this Government to visit the United States.

The Vice President will remain in Honolulu and San Francisco for a few days and is expected to arrive in Washington May 6. The party will be the guests of this Government at the Blair House.

Control of Coal Exports in Western Zones of Germany

[Released to the press simultaneously in Washington, London, and Paris on April 21]

It was announced jointly on April 21 by the American, British, and French Governments that an arrangement has been made to fix the proportion of coal exports from their zones of occupation in Germany to the coal-importing countries of Europe for the six-month period beginning July 1, 1947. Exports will be fixed in terms of percentages of net merchantable coal production beginning at 21 percent when the daily output of clean bituminous and anthracite coal in the western zones reaches 280,000 tons a day, and rising to 25 percent when it reaches 370,000 tons a day.

The scale of percentages takes account on the one hand of the needs of coal for the reconstruction of the liberated countries of Europe who have always been dependent on imports of German coal; and on the other of the essential industrial and other requirements of the German economy.

The arrangement will facilitate planning both by the coal-importing countries and by the authorities in charge of the economics in Germany. It is subject to review at the end of 1947.

It has also been decided that when the economic incorporation of the Saar with France has been decided upon, a joint notification will be made to the European Coal Organization, indicating that in future France will present to ECO both the resources and the needs of France and the Saar as a whole, and inviting ECO to take account of this new situation.

The present arrangement represents the results of long discussions and has been confirmed by the three Foreign Ministers.

Visit of President of Mexico

At the invitation of President Truman, His Excellency Miguel Alemán, President of Mexico, arrived in Washington on April 29 to be the official guest of the United States Government until May 7. His visit was the first official visit by a Mexican President in office to this country's capital. After remaining several days in Washington, the official party visited New York, N. Y., Chattanooga, Tenn., and Kansas City, Mo.

Elisabeth Enochs To Attend Institute for Protection of Childhood

[Released to the press April 22]

The Acting Secretary of State announced on April 22 that Mrs. Elisabeth Shirley Enochs, Director of the Inter-American Cooperation Service of the Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, has been designated as alternate technical delegate of the United States to attend the regular annual meeting of the Executive Council of the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood. This meeting is scheduled to be held at Montevideo, Uruguay, beginning on April 25, 1947.

The Institute was established with headquarters at Montevideo in 1927 in accordance with a resolution of the Fourth Pan American Child Congress (1924). A permanent official pan-American agency for the promotion of child welfare in the American republics, the Institute is a center of social action, information, advice, and study of all questions relating to child life and welfare. The Executive Council, which is composed of representatives of member states, directs the Institute's activities.

United States participation in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood was authorized by Congress in 1928. Since that time Miss Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief, United States Children's Bureau, has been the technical delegate of the United States. Due to prior commitments she is unable to attend this meeting, and Mrs. Enochs, who has attended four of the Council meetings in the past seven years, is going in her stead. Mrs. Enochs' trip will include stopovers at Rio de Janeiro and Lima where she will have consultations with field representatives of the Children's Bureau.

New Salesroom Opened

Publications of the Department of State and selected publications of other Government agencies are now being sold in Room 120 at 1778 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., one of the buildings occupied by the Department of State. The salesroom was opened as a convenience to visitors to the Department and to persons in Washington. It is operated by an agent of the Superintendent of Documents. Mail orders for the Department's publications should be addressed as in the past to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Paul A. Porter Resigns

The President on April 25 accepted the resignation of Paul A. Porter as Chief of the American Economic Mission to Greece with the personal rank of Ambassador. For texts of Mr. Porter's letter and the President's reply, see White House press release of April 25.

Confirmations to the United Nations

The Senate on April 21, 1947, confirmed the Executive nominations of Warren R. Austin to be the Representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; and of Herschel V. Johnson to be the Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE Confirmations to the Diplomatic and Foreign Service

The Senate on April 9 confirmed the following nominations:

Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Countries Named

Willard L. Beaulac, to Colombia
Walter J. Donnelly, to Costa Rica
John F. Simmons, to Ecuador
Albert F. Nufer, to El Salvador
Paul C. Daniels, to Honduras
Henry F. Grady, to India
Fletcher Warren, to Paraguay
John C. Wiley, to Portugal
Edward F. Stanton, to Siam
Williamson S. Howell, Jr., to Uruguay
Cavendish W. Cannon, to Yugoslavia

Envoy Extraordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Countries Named

Selden Chapin, to Hungary
George A. Garrett, to Ireland
Paul H. Alling, to the Republic of Syria

Contents

The United Nations	Page
U.S. Trusteeship for the Territory of the Pacific Islands. Article by Robert R. Robbins	783
Trusteeship Agreement for the Former Japanese Mandated Islands	791
Special Session of General Assembly Called: Cable of Secretary-General to Members	795
Items Requested for Agenda	795
U.S. Delegation	798
Designating the U.S. Mission to the U.N. and Providing for Its Direction and Administration	798
Summary Statement by the Secretary-General. Security Council Matters	799
U.S. Delegation to First Assembly of ICAO	808
Confirmations to the United Nations	823
Occupation Matters	
Toward Formulating a New Japanese Constitution:	
FEC Interest in Japanese Constitution	802
Principles for a New Japanese Constitution	802
Further Policies for New Japanese Constitution	803
Review of Japanese Constitution	804
Apprehension, Trial, and Punishment of War Criminals in the Far East	804
Determination of Peaceful Needs of Japan	806
Soviet Position on Reconvening of Joint U.S.-U.S.S.R. Commission. Exchange of notes.	812
Control of Coal Exports in Western Zones of Germany	822
The Council of Foreign Ministers	
Moscow Meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers: Discussion of German and Austrian Draft Treaties. Statements by the Secretary of State:	
Reiteration of Position on Disarmament and Demilitarization of Germany	793
Position on Treaty for Reestablishment of Independent and Democratic Austria	793
General Policy	
Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy To Transfer Certain Vessels and Material and To Furnish Certain Assistance to the Republic of China	821
General Policy—Continued	Page
U.S. Military Attachés in China Returned by Communist Captors	822
Philippine Vice President and Foreign Secretary To Visit U.S.	822
Visit of President of Mexico	823
Economic Affairs	
U.S. Delegation to ILO Coal Committee	806
Treaty Information	
Lend-Lease to the U.S.S.R.	814
Protocol on Establishment of Four Power Naval Commission, Disposal of Excess Units of Italian Fleet, and Return by Soviet Union of Warships	815
Protocol Amending Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs:	
The President's Letter of Transmittal	817
Report of the Acting Secretary of State	817
Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation	
U.S. Delegation to IMMRAN	807
Twelfth Pan American Sanitary Conference: Regional Health Programs and WHO	809
Visiting Lecturer of Ceramics to Honduras	822
Elizabeth Enochs To Attend Institute for Protection of Childhood	823
Calendar of International Meetings	800
The Foreign Service	
Confirmations to the Diplomatic and Foreign Service	823
The Congress	816
The Department	
Report of Operations of the Department of State Under Public Law 584	820
Paul A. Porter Resigns	823
New Salesroom Opened	823
Publications	
Foreign Commerce Weekly	820

Contributors

Robert R. Robbins, author of the article on United States trusteeship for the territory of the Pacific Islands, is a Specialist in Dependent Area Affairs, Trusteeship Branch, Division of Dependent Area Affairs, Office of Special Political Affairs, Department of State.